

Howell v. City of Zion, et al.
Case No.: 16 CV 3949

EXHIBIT B

**RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION**

April 04, 2017

1-4

Page 1	Page 3
<p>1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT</p> <p>2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS</p> <p>3 EASTERN DIVISION</p> <p>4 ALICE HOWELL, Independent)</p> <p>5 Administrator of the Estate)</p> <p>6 of JUSTUS HOWELL,)</p> <p>7 Plaintiff,) No. 16 CV 3949</p> <p>8 -vs-)</p> <p>9 CITY OF ZION, a municipal)</p> <p>10 corporation, OFFICER ERIC)</p> <p>11 HILL, (#47),)</p> <p>12 Defendants.)</p> <p>13</p> <p>14 The deposition of RONALD SCOTT, called</p> <p>15 for examination, taken pursuant to the Federal</p> <p>16 Rules of Civil Procedure of the United States</p> <p>17 District Courts pertaining to the taking of</p> <p>18 depositions, taken before THERESA A. VORKAPIC, a</p> <p>19 Notary Public within and for the County of Kane,</p> <p>20 State of Illinois, and a Certified Shorthand</p> <p>21 Reporter, CSR No. 84-2589, of said state, at 140</p> <p>22 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois, on</p> <p>23 April 4, 2017, at approximately 9:35 a.m.</p> <p>24</p>	<p>1 PRESENT: (Continued)</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 STETLER DUFFY & ROTERT, LTD.,</p> <p>4 10 South LaSalle Street, Suite 2800,</p> <p>5 Chicago, Illinois 60603,</p> <p>6 312-338-0217, by:</p> <p>7 MS. MARIAH E. MORAN,</p> <p>8 mmoran@sdrlegal.com,</p> <p>9 appeared on behalf of Plaintiff;</p> <p>10 ANCEL GLINK DIAMOND BUSH DiCIANNI</p> <p>11 & KRAFTHEFER,</p> <p>12 140 South Dearborn Street,</p> <p>13 Chicago, Illinois 60603,</p> <p>14 312-782-7606, by:</p> <p>15 MR. THOMAS G. DiCIANNI,</p> <p>16 tdicianni@ancelglink.com,</p> <p>17 MS. ELIZABETH K. BARTON,</p> <p>18 ebarton@ancelglink.com,</p> <p>19 appeared on behalf of Defendants.</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p>
Page 2	Page 4
<p>1 PRESENT:</p> <p>2 ACTION INJURY LAW GROUP, LLC,</p> <p>3 191 North Wacker Drive, Suite 2300,</p> <p>4 Chicago, Illinois 60606,</p> <p>5 312-578-9390, by:</p> <p>6 MR. CARLTON ODIM,</p> <p>7 carlton@actioninjurylawgroup.com,</p> <p>8 MR. ANDREW M. STROTH,</p> <p>9 astroth@actioninjurylawgroup.com,</p> <p>10 -and-</p> <p>11 EDWIN F. MANDEL LEGAL AID CLINIC,</p> <p>12 The University of Chicago Law School,</p> <p>13 6020 S. University Avenue,</p> <p>14 Chicago, Illinois 60637,</p> <p>15 773-702-9611, by:</p> <p>16 MR. CRAIG B. FUTTERMAN,</p> <p>17 futterman@uchicago.edu,</p> <p>18 -and-</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p>	<p>1 ALSO PRESENT:</p> <p>2 MS. BAHAR T. AZARI, Paralegal,</p> <p>3 Ancel Glink Diamond Bush DiCianni</p> <p>4 & Krafthefer;</p> <p>5 MS. MICA MOORE,</p> <p>6 MR. ANDREW SOWLE,</p> <p>7 MR. JEREMY CHEN,</p> <p>8 University of Chicago Police</p> <p>9 Accountability Clinic, Law Students.</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19 REPORTED BY: THERESA A. VORKAPIC, CSR, RPR,</p> <p>20 CSR License No. 84-2589</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p>

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZIONApril 04, 2017
5-8

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5</p> <p>1 PROCEEDINGS</p> <p>2 (WHEREUPON, the witness was duly</p> <p>3 sworn.)</p> <p>4 RONALD R. SCOTT,</p> <p>5 called as a witness herein, having been first duly</p> <p>6 sworn, was examined and testified as follows:</p> <p>7 EXAMINATION</p> <p>8 BY MR. DICIANNI:</p> <p>9 Q. Sir, would you state your name for the</p> <p>10 record, please.</p> <p>11 A. First name is Ronald, Ronald, middle</p> <p>12 initial is R, my last name is Scott, S-c-o-t-t.</p> <p>13 Q. Mr. Scott, you have given many</p> <p>14 depositions before I understand, correct?</p> <p>15 A. Several.</p> <p>16 Q. If I asked you to estimate, would you</p> <p>17 be able to do that?</p> <p>18 A. In excess of 50. I believe less than a</p> <p>19 hundred.</p> <p>20 Q. How many times would you say you've</p> <p>21 testified at trial?</p> <p>22 A. Approximately 300 times.</p> <p>23 Q. 300 times. Would that include your</p> <p>24 time as a law enforcement officer?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p> <p>1 questions, as you know, you have to do it</p> <p>2 verbally. The court reporter is taking down what</p> <p>3 we talk about today. You know that.</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. If I ask you a question that you don't</p> <p>6 understand, which could happen, or you don't hear</p> <p>7 me or whatever it is, please let me know that</p> <p>8 because we all want to be able to assume that any</p> <p>9 answer you give is an answer you intended to give.</p> <p>10 A. Understood.</p> <p>11 Q. Fair enough?</p> <p>12 A. Thank you.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. I have in front of me your</p> <p>14 report, which we'll get to in a second.</p> <p>15 You have a business which I believe is</p> <p>16 just in your name, Ronald R. Scott?</p> <p>17 A. Yes, that's correct.</p> <p>18 Q. And after your name you have MA and MS.</p> <p>19 What does MA and MS stand for?</p> <p>20 A. That's for Master of Arts and Master of</p> <p>21 Science.</p> <p>22 Q. You have a Master of Arts and a Master</p> <p>23 of Science?</p> <p>24 A. Yes, I do.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p> <p>1 A. Yes, it would.</p> <p>2 Q. So if we excluded times you testified</p> <p>3 as a police officer, how many times would you say</p> <p>4 you testified at trial?</p> <p>5 A. Between 75 to a hundred, best</p> <p>6 estimation.</p> <p>7 Q. Each one of those would have been in</p> <p>8 some role as a trial consultant of some type?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Expert witness?</p> <p>11 A. Yes, it would have involved a legal</p> <p>12 proceeding of some sort.</p> <p>13 Q. Did you act as an expert witness in 75</p> <p>14 to 100 trials where you've testified?</p> <p>15 A. Or depositions, but you asked</p> <p>16 specifically about trials.</p> <p>17 Q. Yes.</p> <p>18 A. Yes, I did.</p> <p>19 Q. You know what we're going to do today,</p> <p>20 but let me just remind you about a few things.</p> <p>21 A. Yes, please do.</p> <p>22 Q. I'm going to ask you questions that</p> <p>23 pertain to the opinions you've given related to</p> <p>24 this case, okay. When you respond to my</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p> <p>1 Q. What is your Master of Arts in?</p> <p>2 A. Master of Arts is in criminal justice.</p> <p>3 My Master of Science is in management.</p> <p>4 Q. When did you get your Master of Arts</p> <p>5 and where?</p> <p>6 A. Master of arts was in 1980. Master of</p> <p>7 Science I believe was 1990.</p> <p>8 Q. From where?</p> <p>9 A. Master of Arts was in Anna Maria</p> <p>10 College, in Paxton, Massachusetts, the Master</p> <p>11 Science in management was from Lesley University</p> <p>12 in Cambridge, Massachusetts.</p> <p>13 Q. That would have been 1990?</p> <p>14 A. 1990 for the Master of Science.</p> <p>15 Q. Where did you go to for your</p> <p>16 undergraduate education?</p> <p>17 A. Northeastern University. I have a</p> <p>18 Bachelor of Science cum laude in law enforcement.</p> <p>19 I also have an Associate in Science in I'm not</p> <p>20 sure what it is, it's either criminal justice or</p> <p>21 criminology.</p> <p>22 Q. What year were you conferred the</p> <p>23 Bachelor of Science at Northeastern University?</p> <p>24 A. 1979.</p>

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
9-12

Page 9

1 Q. Since graduation in 1979, you have
2 studied further and you've worked in law
3 enforcement and you've worked as a litigation
4 consultant, fair enough?
5 **A. Yes.**
6 Q. Your current business Ronald R. Scott,
7 is it incorporated?
8 A. No, it's not. Sole proprietor.
9 Q. It's located in Phoenix, Arizona?
10 **A. Yes.**
11 Q. 37881 North 10th Street is the address
12 of the business?
13 **A. Correct.**
14 Q. Is it also your home?
15 A. Yes, it is.
16 Q. You have no other business location?
17 **A. None.**
18 Q. Do you have any employees?
19 A. Myself only.
20 Q. Do you ever use independent contractors
21 or any type of consultants to help you with cases?
22 A. I'll refer them to an attorney, but I
23 don't get involved retaining them personally.
24 Q. Well, I guess I'm not sure you

Page 10

1 understood what I meant.
2 Do you ever engage other experts to
3 help you evaluate cases that you've been hired to
4 consult on?
5 A. Not personally, no.
6 Q. Did you do all the work in this case to
7 prepare your report and arrive at your opinions,
8 do it all yourself?
9 A. I did it, yes, myself.
10 Q. Are you married?
11 A. I am.
12 Q. And your wife?
13 A. My wife is Maria.
14 Q. Is Maria employed outside the home in
15 any way?
16 **A. Self-employed.**
17 Q. What does she do?
18 A. She owns a sign and truck lettering
19 business, and she also makes jewelry.
20 **Q. Children?**
21 A. Two adult children.
22 Q. Names and ages.
23 A. David, David is going to be 46 in May.
24 My youngest son is Christopher, '72, he's 44.

Page 11

1 Q. What do they do for a living?
2 A. My youngest son Christopher is a
3 certified public accountant and my oldest son
4 David is a over-the-road truck driver, commercial
5 truck driver.
6 Q. Neither followed you into the law
7 enforcement industry?
8 A. Neither followed me.
9 Q. I notice on your report your logo has
10 Ronald Scott with a microscope in the middle.
11 A. It's a microscope.
12 Q. Forensic ballistics underneath?
13 **A. Correct.**
14 Q. Is ballistics sort of your primary
15 expertise?
16 A. No. Shooting reconstruction and crime
17 scenes are my primary expertise, but it does
18 involve some aspects of ballistics and I do do
19 some work with engineers and architects and others
20 that involve just pure ballistics work.
21 Q. Why did you highlight ballistics only
22 in your logo?
23 A. I don't know. My wife is the artist
24 and she made that logo and I said that's fine.

Page 12

1 Q. She designed it?
2 **A. Yes.**
3 Q. How long have you been using the
4 logo?
5 A. That logo?
6 Q. That one.
7 A. I believe since about 2002.
8 Q. Are you a member of any association in
9 which you get referrals for expert witness
10 consultation? Do you know what I'm talking about?
11 A. Yes. I've received referrals from
12 members that are associates of mine, but not from
13 the association itself.
14 Q. So there are and I'm sure you know
15 this, there are organizations or companies really
16 that will advertise themselves as providing expert
17 witnesses in cases. TASA would be an example of
18 that if you are familiar.
19 **A. Right.**
20 Q. Do you get referrals from any company
21 like that?
22 A. Yes. I've been contacted by some
23 companies like that.
24 Q. Which ones?

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
13-16

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 13</p> <p>1 A. TASA was one. There's another one. I 2 believe it's called Consolidated Consultants. I 3 think there's an additional one, DJS Associates. 4 I think they're in Pennsylvania. There is a local 5 agency in Phoenix that contacted me. I haven't 6 received any referrals from them. 7 Q. So you've received referrals from the 8 other two. DJS -- other three I should say, TASA, 9 the second one you told me about and then DJS? 10 A. Yes, that's correct. 11 Q. Do all of your cases come through these 12 referral programs? 13 A. No. Very, very few. 14 Q. Do you advertise? 15 A. I have a website. 16 Q. Do you do anything else to promote your 17 business? 18 A. No. No commercial advertising. 19 Q. One of the things that we -- I should 20 have mentioned is you're anticipating my questions 21 so you're talking over me, and we're going to 22 drive her crazy and I tend to talk slowly anyway. 23 A. I'll give her a chance to -- 24 Q. Before she erupts.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 15</p> <p>1 Q. You just haven't done it. You say on 2 your report, you list at the top and we'll have it 3 in a second, sorry about that, the different areas 4 that you provide consultation in, it starts with 5 firearms and ends with trajectory analysis. 6 You know what I'm talking about? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. You have on here Daubert consultation. 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. What do you do in what you call a 11 Daubert consultation? 12 A. Most of that falls into the category of 13 tool mark methodology, although it can fall into 14 some of the other areas such as the examination of 15 firearms. Some of the cases which I am inquired 16 of involve reviewing conclusions made by crime 17 laboratories or other experts. So one of the 18 areas that I would look if in is what is the 19 methodology that they have done and is it in 20 conformance with the current standards being used 21 in the industry, and then I would provide advice 22 to the counsel as to whether or not there might be 23 an issue they would want to consider exploring. 24 Q. So if I'm understanding you correctly,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 14</p> <p>1 So your website -- in terms of 2 advertisement if we could call it that, your 3 website would be the only way that you market or 4 promote your business? 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. Do you speak at conferences and 7 seminars for lawyers? 8 A. I do if time is available to me, yes. 9 Q. What organizations -- lawyer 10 organizations have you given presentations to? 11 A. The American Academy of Forensic 12 Sciences. Usually it's a joint session of the 13 juris prudence section and the engineering section 14 that I would be giving presentations to. 15 Q. Any others? 16 A. Not recently. 17 Q. Did you ever speak to DRI or ITLA, 18 American College of Trial Lawyers, any of these 19 other organizations that put on seminars? 20 A. Unfortunately time has not allowed me 21 to do it. 22 Q. Have you been invited? 23 A. I have. I just haven't had the 24 opportunity.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 16</p> <p>1 first you would identify some standard that would 2 govern a methodology that would be applicable to 3 whatever opinion or consultation you're reviewing 4 and then determine if whoever rendered that 5 opinion or did that consultation worked 6 consistently with that standard; is that fair to 7 say? 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. What are you looking for in terms of 10 compliance? 11 A. Specifics? 12 Q. No, general. 13 A. For example -- 14 Q. Yes, for example. 15 A. There are guidelines and the current 16 guidelines are being reviewed at the present time 17 to set new standards for the industry, but the 18 current guidelines as they are set now call for 19 certain methods to be employed in testing and what 20 I'm looking at is have personnel in crime labs 21 doing firearms examinations or crime scene type of 22 work, are they following the current standards as 23 they're currently published in looking to see what 24 conclusions they've reached from what they have</p>

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZIONApril 04, 2017
17-20

Page 17

1 done. So I'm really looking at what the

2 methodology is that they've employed and what
3 conclusions they've reached.

4 Q. So when you do a Daubert consultation,
5 you give an opinion on whether the methodology is
6 reliable, correct?

7 A. That has occurred, yes.

8 Q. You don't necessarily give an opinion
9 on whether the conclusion you agree with or
10 disagree with, you just focus on the methodology,
11 correct?

12 A. Sometimes it could be a combination. I
13 could be looking not only at the methodology but I
14 could also be actually examining the evidence to
15 see what conclusion I've reached. So it could be
16 a combination of both critiquing the methodology
17 and at the same time testifying to my conclusions
18 based upon the generally accepted methodology that
19 I employ.

20 Q. You would fold that all into a Daubert
21 consultation?

22 A. Well, if that's how it was presented in
23 court. I mean, obviously I can't control the
24 questions, but it's happened, yes.

Page 18

1 Q. Can you give me a case reference in
2 which you actually testified in a Daubert hearing?

3 A. I know I've testified in several over
4 the past year.

5 Q. I'm sorry. You did in the past year?

6 A. In the past year I've testified in
7 several.

8 Q. Daubert hearings?

9 A. Yes. Arizona versus Dean Babbitt I
10 know is one, Arizona versus Linda Frias is
11 another. I know there are some others, but I'd
12 have to look at my records.

13 Q. So these are obviously criminal cases,
14 criminal prosecutions?

15 A. Yes. Those are criminal cases.

16 Q. In these cases, you're called on to
17 testify about -- not to render your own opinions
18 but to testify -- well, I suppose it would be your
19 own opinions but not to render your own opinions
20 on the substance of the case but to testify about
21 the methodology employed by some other expert
22 witness; is that fair to say?

23 A. In the Babbitt case, it was a
24 combination of the methodology employed and my own

Page 19

1 conclusions. In the Frias case, the Frias case
2 wasn't so much methodology as it was presenting
3 testimony regarding some treatises and studies on
4 the aspect of an unintentional or involuntary
5 discharge of a firearm.

6 Q. Were you rendering an opinion about
7 some substantive issue in that case or were you
8 only focusing on whether some other expert's
9 opinions should be admissible based on the Daubert
10 standards, in either one of these cases?

11 A. Right, in the Frias case, I did not
12 testify to anything other than some of the
13 treatises and studies on involuntary discharge,
14 but it did include testifying to some what I call
15 exclusionary opinions based upon the alleged facts
16 of the case and the lack of evidence supporting
17 those facts.

18 In the Babbitt case, the Babbitt case
19 involved critiquing the methodology that employed
20 -- this was a cold case from the 1990s recently
21 brought to trial, so that involved the methodology
22 involved almost 20 years ago at the crime scene,
23 but then reaching my own conclusions based upon
24 the information I had. So that was both.

Page 20

1 Q. Where were those cases?

2 A. Maricopa County Superior Court,
3 Arizona.

4 Q. Have there been other cases where
5 you've testified as a Daubert expert?

6 A. There have been, yes.

7 Q. You have included your case list at
8 least for the last four years in your report.
9 We'll go over that a little bit later, but would
10 we find cases in that list where you testified as
11 a Daubert consultant?

12 A. I would certainly recall them by
13 looking at that list.

14 Q. All right. We'll do that a little bit
15 later. Let's mark your report as Scott Exhibit 1.

16 (WHEREUPON, a certain document was
17 marked Scott Deposition Exhibit
18 No. 1 for identification, as of
19 04/04/2017.)

20 BY MR. DiCIANNI:

21 Q. In the first part of your report, you
22 discuss -- well, your report is broken down based
23 on different aspects of the consultation that you
24 did in the case, correct?

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
21-24

1A. Yes.

Page 21

2 Q. And in the beginning you talk about
3 your engagement and compensation, and you say you
4 were engaged in this case to examine certain
5 aspects concerning the fatal shooting of Justus
6 Howell by Officer Eric Hill.

7 What did you consider to be your focus
8 or your engagement in this case?

9 A. All the information provided to me
10 which includes reviewing the entire case file, to
11 include visiting the actual scene and making my
12 own measurements and then placing everything into
13 perspective and making my own conclusions as
14 scientifically and reliably as I could.

15 Q. Was it to test the version of the
16 events as described by Officer Hill?

17 A. Yes. I'm looking at the physical
18 evidence and the forensic evidence, tangible and
19 intangible, and then I'm comparing it to the
20 source materials which included the version of
21 events by Officer Hill and others.

22 Q. So in the end, your mission, I'll put
23 it that way, was to evaluate Officer Hill's
24 version of the events in the way that your

1 at either myself or a number of experts to retain
2 to review the case file.

3 Q. Is that when he told you he wanted you
4 to rebut Officer Hill's testimony?

5 A. I wasn't actually retained until I
6 think it was probably a few weeks later.

7 Q. So you were retained for that purpose a
8 few weeks later?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And did you have continuing
11 communications with Mr. Rubenstein or any other
12 lawyers representing the plaintiff regarding the
13 case?

14 A. I did.

15 Q. Did you have any -- and then you were
16 provided with materials, correct?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Did they provide you -- did any of the
19 attorneys for the plaintiff provide you with any
20 data or other information that you considered in
21 arriving at your conclusions?

22 A. Only the source materials that are
23 listed. No verbal data.

24 Q. That's what I was asking. The answer

Page 23

Page 22

1 expertise allows you to do, correct?

2 A. That's a fair statement.

3 Q. When were you first engaged in this
4 case?

5 A. My best recollection is late last year,
6 2016. I don't know the exact month. I'd have to
7 estimate in the October to November area would be
8 approximately correct.

9 Q. How were you contacted?

10 A. I believe I was contacted by attorney
11 Cory Rubinstein.

12 Q. Mr. Rubinstein contacted you by
13 telephone, would that be fair?

14 A. I'm not sure if it was telephone or
15 e-mail.

16 Q. So there was an initial communication
17 of some type which caused you to have further
18 communications, that's obvious?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. What did Mr. Rubenstein tell you in the
21 first consultation?

22 A. I don't recall verbatim of course, but
23 it involved a police-involved shooting,
24 officer-involved shooting, and they were looking

1 is no to that question?

2 A. Correct.

3 Q. They didn't provide you with any
4 version verbally during some communication or
5 through an e-mail communication that you
6 considered in arriving at your opinions?

7 A. No, not outside of the source
8 materials.

9 Q. Your report goes on to discuss your
10 qualifications and we'll talk about your CV a
11 little later.

12 A. Okay.

13 Q. Then it goes on to discuss the science
14 of shooting reconstruction generally, correct?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. How would you define shooting
17 reconstruction as a science?

18 A. Well, it's the application of crime
19 scene analysis, the examination of physical
20 evidence and intangible evidence including time,
21 motion and distance using generally accepted
22 methods employed in the field and then reaching
23 conclusions, scientific conclusions where
24 possible, and where scientific conclusions may not

Page 24

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017

25-28

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p> <p>1 be as strong as others to clarify that and present</p> <p>2 them in terms that don't mislead the finder of</p> <p>3 fact that I would be overstating some aspect of</p> <p>4 the conclusion.</p> <p>5 Q. Do you have any signed of a</p> <p>6 certification to do shooting reconstruction?</p> <p>7 A. I voluntarily submit to independent</p> <p>8 testing through the Collaborative Testing Service.</p> <p>9 That's called CTS. It involves firearms and tool</p> <p>10 mark examinations. As far as other</p> <p>11 certifications, there's none that I'm aware of,</p> <p>12 different certifications.</p> <p>13 Q. So there's nothing that requires you to</p> <p>14 have any particular level of competency in the</p> <p>15 form of a test or something like that and gives</p> <p>16 you a certificate as a result?</p> <p>17 A. That's correct.</p> <p>18 Q. That doesn't exist or you've never done</p> <p>19 it?</p> <p>20 A. I think there are some areas that might</p> <p>21 pick out certain aspects of certain areas like</p> <p>22 photography or something like that, but nothing in</p> <p>23 the general aspect of, say, shooting</p> <p>24 reconstruction, no. There's nothing that I'm</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 27</p> <p>1 Q. While you were a consultant, though,</p> <p>2 not as a law enforcement officer?</p> <p>3 A. As a private independent consultant.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you know if you're allowed to do</p> <p>5 shooting reconstruction in Illinois if you're not</p> <p>6 a licensed investigator in Illinois?</p> <p>7 A. I'm not aware.</p> <p>8 Q. You haven't researched that?</p> <p>9 A. No.</p> <p>10 Q. You're not affiliated with any licensed</p> <p>11 private investigators in Illinois, correct?</p> <p>12 A. I am not.</p> <p>13 Q. Do you hold any licenses other than a</p> <p>14 driver's licensing or a fishing licensing, like</p> <p>15 professional licenses?</p> <p>16 A. No, I do not.</p> <p>17 Q. You mentioned two authorities in your</p> <p>18 Section 3 on shooting reconstruction; you talk</p> <p>19 about Peter DeForest, Robert Gaensslen and</p> <p>20 Dr. Henry Lee and their treatises, and then you</p> <p>21 talk about Lucien and Michael Haag in their</p> <p>22 treatise.</p> <p>23 Do you consider those two treatises to</p> <p>24 be authoritative in the area of forensic sciences?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 26</p> <p>1 aware of.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Is there something in the</p> <p>3 general forensic sciences, a certification just in</p> <p>4 the general forensic sciences that you're aware</p> <p>5 of?</p> <p>6 A. No, I'm not.</p> <p>7 Q. You're no longer a sworn law</p> <p>8 enforcement officer?</p> <p>9 A. No. I'm retired.</p> <p>10 Q. Are you a licensed private</p> <p>11 investigator?</p> <p>12 A. No, I'm not.</p> <p>13 Q. Do you have any licenses in Illinois?</p> <p>14 A. I do not.</p> <p>15 Q. Have you ever provided testimony in</p> <p>16 Illinois?</p> <p>17 A. I have.</p> <p>18 Q. How many times?</p> <p>19 A. I think it's only one or two times.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you remember what those cases were</p> <p>21 about?</p> <p>22 A. I do not.</p> <p>23 Q. Do you remember when they were?</p> <p>24 A. A long time ago, many years.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 28</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Do you consider them authoritative in</p> <p>3 shooting reconstruction?</p> <p>4 A. The will book by Haag I do, by the</p> <p>5 Haags, both Haags. I'm not sure of the DeForest.</p> <p>6 DeForest is more of a crime scene analyst.</p> <p>7 Q. Do you consider shooting reconstruction</p> <p>8 sort of a subcategory or subset of the general</p> <p>9 forensic sciences?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. Are there any other publications or</p> <p>12 treatises that you consider to be authoritative in</p> <p>13 the area of general forensic sciences?</p> <p>14 A. Yes. There is another book that I</p> <p>15 commonly refer to. It's a book by Ed Hueske,</p> <p>16 H-u-e-s-k-e. That book deals with shooting</p> <p>17 reconstruction; the book by Dr. Vincent DiMaio,</p> <p>18 Practical Aspects of Gunshot Wounds. There are a</p> <p>19 number of other books. I don't recall them all,</p> <p>20 but those are the main ones that I use.</p> <p>21 Q. That you use?</p> <p>22 A. That I use.</p> <p>23 Q. Is Dr. DiMaio's book authoritative on</p> <p>24 shooting reconstruction?</p>

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
29-32

Page 29

1 A. In the sense that it deals with gunshot
2 wounds, angles and how to interpret gunshot
3 wounds. He also talks about ammunition, yes, I
4 think it is.
5 Q. He talks about various aspects of
6 forensic sciences that you employ in shooting
7 reconstruction?
8 **A. Yes.**
9 Q. What would you consider to be the most
10 authoritative book on the overall science, on the
11 general -- I'm sorry. Let me rephrase that.
12 What would you consider to be the most
13 authoritative source on the specific science of
14 shooting reconstruction?
15 A. I think the had Haag book, Lucien Haag
16 and Michael Haag.
17 Q. Your report then goes on to discuss
18 source materials, and you break it down from
19 A to R.
20 Is that everything that you reviewed in
21 your study of this case?
22 A. Yes, it is.
23 Q. You did not review the entire Lake
24 County Major Crimes Task Force investigation?

Page 30

1 A. Whatever is listed is what I received.
2 Q. How was it determined that these would
3 be the only or the source materials that you would
4 review?
5 A. This was provided to me by Attorney
6 Rubenstein.
7 Q. Okay. Obviously because there isn't
8 anything else listed, you didn't ask for anything
9 more; is that fair?
10 A. That's a fair statement.
11 Q. Did everything on this list have some
12 evidentiary value to your opinions?
13 A. No, it did not.
14 Q. Tell me which ones did have some
15 evidentiary value to your opinions?
16 A. By letter? That would be the best way.
17 Q. Yes, letter is fine.
18 A. A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, K, L, M, N,
19 I'm not sure about O at this point, P, Q and R.
20 Q. Now, regarding the autopsy photos and
21 crime scene photos, you didn't identify which ones
22 and I don't know that there would have been an
23 ability for you to do so, but did you bring those
24 with you?

Page 31

1 A. I have them on a disk.
2 (WHEREUPON, Andrew Stroth
3 entered the deposition
4 proceedings.)
5 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
6 Q. That's good because otherwise we were
7 going to be going through this entire book here.
8 So if I could ask you to pull those up and if you
9 want we can take a break while we're doing that.
10 So why don't we take a short break.
11 (WHEREUPON, a recess was had.)
12 (WHEREUPON, Andrew Stroth
13 left the deposition proceedings.)
14 MR. DiCIANNI: We're back on the record.
15 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
16 Q. When we broke, Mr. Scott, we were
17 talking about the autopsy photos and we were
18 hoping that what you brought with you would narrow
19 down the universe of photographs that you looked
20 at in order to determine your opinions, it looks
21 like you have all the autopsy it photos in your
22 file; is that correct?
23 **A. Yes.**
24 Q. So I guess when we get to the point

Page 32

1 where the autopsy photos were relevant to your
2 opinion, we'll have to go through them one by one
3 and you can tell us what was important for your
4 decision, okay?
5 A. That's okay.
6 Q. All right. Your report contains all of
7 the opinions that you have in this case?
8 A. Yes, as far as I know.
9 Q. Okay. So we won't have to waste time
10 asking about other opinions unless they're in
11 here, all right.
12 A. I think that's a fair statement.
13 Q. As I read your report, I would say that
14 your -- I would summarize your report and your
15 opinions as the following and you can correct me
16 if I'm wrong. As an overall --
17 MR. ODIM: I would object. The report speaks
18 for itself. Your summary is your summary.
19 MR. DiCIANNI: That's fine.
20 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
21 Q. The overall opinion is the shooting
22 didn't occur the way Hill says it did, correct?
23 A. Well, that's one of my opinions, yes.
24 Q. You disagree that Justus Howell turned

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017

33-36

Page 33

1 toward Hill in the way Officer Hill described it,
2 correct?
3 A. That's another opinion, yes.
4 Q. You disagree that Officer Hill fired
5 his shot when he said he did; you believe it was
6 later, correct?
7 **A. Correct.**
8 Q. Do you disagree that Howell was armed?
9 A. I do not know if he was armed.
10 Q. Okay. You have an opinion about the
11 video and we'll talk about that when we get to
12 that, but you don't have an opinion as to whether
13 he was armed or not?
14 A. That's correct.
15 Q. And overall you believe Hill fired his
16 two shots as shown on the video between frames 281
17 to 285 or even 287; is that fair to say? And let
18 me clarify. The video I'm referring to is the
19 surveillance video from the business that was a
20 short distance away?
21 A. I'm not sure I agree with that.
22 Q. What's incorrect about that, about that
23 last statement?
24 A. I know one of my opinions is that a

Page 34

1 shot was fired at or after frame 287. I'm not
2 sure about one of the shots.
3 Q. So you're saying that you believe --
4 you disagree with the part of my reference -- the
5 part of my summary that referred to frames 281 to
6 285, you would make that 281 to 287 or later? Am
7 I understanding that correctly?
8 A. No. I don't think that's what I wrote
9 in my report.
10 Q. Correct me, then, in what that opinion
11 is as to when Officer Hill fired his two shots as
12 shown on the video.
13 A. Well, I know one of the opinions is
14 that the second shot was fired at or later than
15 approximately frame 287. Another shot was fired
16 prior to that. I don't think I've reached a
17 conclusion as to the sequence of frames in which
18 that shot was fired.
19 Q. So your opinion is the second shot was
20 fired at 287 or later; the first shot you're not
21 rendering an opinion on when it was fired?
22 A. I don't have an opinion as to the
23 specific frame sequence.
24 Q. Do you believe it was after frame 281?

Page 35

1 A. I'd have to look at the frame numbers.
2 Q. At some point, we'll get to that, and
3 you can correct me on what I have summarized as
4 your opinion.
5 Now, your opinions are based on as you
6 explained it in your report the security video and
7 comparison with Officer Hill's testimony, correct?
8 A. That's part of it, yes.
9 Q. The autopsy findings regarding the
10 gunshot wound trajectory and angles, correct?
11 A. It that's part of it.
12 Q. The location of the casings?
13 **A. Correct.**
14 Q. The testimony of Officer Gildea
15 regarding his location?
16 **A. Yes.**
17 Q. Was there anything else? There's
18 obviously a lot of other information, but in terms
19 of the source materials that you used to derive
20 your opinions, it's those materials, correct?
21 A. Once again, please.
22 Q. Security video in comparison with
23 Officer Hill's testimony?
24 A. That's correct.

Page 36

1 Q. The autopsy findings regarding the
2 gunshot wound trajectory and angles?
3 A. I agree.
4 Q. The location of the casings?
5 **A. Correct.**
6 Q. Officer Gildea's testimony about his
7 location when he heard the gunshots?
8 **A. Correct.**
9 Q. And is there anything else?
10 A. My personal inspection of the scene.
11 Q. What part of your opinions did your
12 personal inspection of the scene inform?
13 A. I took measurements.
14 Q. In what part of your -- in which of
15 your opinions did those measurements come into
16 play?
17 A. Those measurements come into play with
18 the location of the discharged cartridge cases,
19 referencing the video in relation to the location
20 of Officer Hill and the victim, and just the
21 general overall perspective of being at the scene
22 and placing everything into context.
23 Q. You didn't give us your measurements.
24 Do you have those?

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
37-40

Page 37

1 A. They should have been provided to you.
2 You should have those.
3 Q. Maybe I'm wrong. Take a look at your
4 report and let me know if you're in here. I don't
5 recall seeing them.
6 A. They're not in the report. They're on
7 a separate page.
8 Q. I don't think we got that. Do you have
9 that?
10 A. I do.
11 Q. Is that in the form of something you
12 wrote out?
13 A. I wrote it out and it was converted to
14 a PDF and supplied to Attorney Rubinstein.
15 Q. Is it on disk or hard copy?
16 A. I have a hard copy.
17 Q. Did you take any notes in connection
18 with your study here other than measurements?
19 A. Only mental.
20 Q. No written notes?
21 A. No.
22 Q. So the next break I will ask you to get
23 out your measurements, okay?
24 A. Okay.

Page 38

1 Q. The video -- the security video is
2 important to your opinions, correct?
3 A. Yes, it is.
4 Q. If the court were to rule that the
5 video is inadmissible, would you still have a
6 reliable basis for your opinions?
7 A. I don't know how to answer that. I
8 think that's up to the court, but it would be an
9 important item of evidence.
10 Q. I'm not asking you for a legal ruling.
11 You're not an attorney. I understand that.
12 I'm talking about from a forensic
13 scientist perspective where you would make an
14 evaluation about whether your methodologies are
15 reliable and whether your conclusions are reliable
16 based on the materials that you reviewed, if the
17 security video is excluded, are your opinions
18 still reliable?
19 A. Still what?
20 Q. Can you still provide reliable
21 testimony at trial without using the security
22 video?
23 A. I think it would be compromised.
24 Q. To the extent that you would yourself

Page 39

1 say you couldn't say to a reasonable degree of
2 forensic science certainty that they're valid?
3 A. I think there would be some aspects
4 that I could testify to, but the video is a
5 critical item.
6 Q. Well, you would not be able to talk
7 about whether Hill -- I'm sorry, whether Justus
8 Howell turned in the way Hill described, correct?
9 A. I agree.
10 Q. Would you still be able to give
11 opinions regarding the positioning of the two
12 people at the time of the shooting without the
13 video?
14 A. It would be difficult, but to some
15 extent I think I could give some partial opinions.
16 Q. That you would consider to be
17 reliable?
18 A. Yes.
19 Q. Would you be able to continue to
20 disagree with Hill's testimony -- well, let me
21 rephrase that.
22 You construe Hill's testimony as being
23 that he fired a shot at frame 257, correct?
24 A. That's his testimony, at or about 257.

Page 40

1 Q. At or about 257, right?
2 A. Yes.
3 Q. And you disagree with that, right?
4 A. Yes, I do.
5 Q. Would you still be able to render an
6 opinion disagreeing with when Hill fired the shot
7 if the video was excluded?
8 MS. MORAN: We're going to object in terms of
9 you're reaching -- you're assuming legal
10 conclusions.
11 MR. DiCIANNI: I am.
12 MS. MORAN: And posturing if the -- positing
13 hypotheticals here.
14 MR. DiCIANNI: First of all, I think we need
15 to clarify who is going to be doing the
16 objections. We can't have two lawyers objecting.
17 MR. ODIM: I'll be doing it.
18 MR. DiCIANNI: No offense.
19 MS. MORAN: None taken.
20 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
21 Q. I'm not asking you how would the court
22 rule. I want to clarify. I'm not asking you how
23 the court would rule on an opinion. I'm asking
24 you from the perspective of a forensic scientist

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
41-44

Page 41

1 who holds yourself to a standard in which you will
2 only give opinions if the source materials and the
3 methodology is reliable, correct?
4 **A. Yes.**
5 Q. That's all I'm asking about. Not how
6 the court would rule.
7 **A. Right.**
8 Q. So if the video were excluded, would
9 you still have enough of a basis to disagree with
10 Officer Hill as to when you believe he says he
11 fired the shots?
12 MR. ODIM: Again, we'll object here. The
13 court's ruling on admissibility has nothing to do
14 with the expert's review of materials that inform
15 his opinion.
16 MR. DiCIANNI: Okay. I don't agree, but go
17 ahead.
18 BY THE WITNESS:
19 A. The video would be necessary.
20 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
21 Q. To disagree with a version of when he
22 fired the shots given by Officer Hill, is that
23 what you're saying?
24 A. I disagree and I agree. There are some

Page 42

1 aspects of that I could make opinions on using the
2 other source materials.
3 Q. Using the location of the casings?
4 A. Using the deposition demonstration of
5 Officer Hill as to how Mr. Howell turned.
6 Q. So you still feel like you could give a
7 reliable opinion disagreeing with Hill's testimony
8 about when he fired the shot even without the
9 video?
10 **A. Yes.**
11 Q. And whether Howell turned or didn't
12 turn, you don't believe that Hill fired at the
13 time Howell would have been turned?
14 A. That's correct.
15 Q. If the court were to rule that you
16 don't have -- for whatever reason your conclusions
17 regarding the autopsy findings and the positioning
18 based on the angles were excluded, how would that
19 affect your opinions?
20 MR. ODIM: Objection. Same as stated before.
21 You're assuming matters that have nothing to do
22 with what an expert can rely on in rendering his
23 opinion, and you're asking this expert to also
24 give an opinion regarding the law.

Page 43

1 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
2 Q. Go ahead.
3 A. Could I have it once again, please.
4 MR. DiCIANNI: Would you read it back.
5 (WHEREUPON, the record was read by
6 the reporter.)
7 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
8 Q. Do you understand the question?
9 A. I do. The autopsy positions will be
10 necessary.
11 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
12 Q. For your opinions?
13 **A. Yes.**
14 Q. If the court were to find that your
15 conclusions based on the location of the casings
16 was inadmissible, how would that affect your
17 opinion regarding when Hill fired the shots?
18 MR. ODIM: Tom, just to make this efficient,
19 are you going to --
20 MR. DiCIANNI: You can have a standing
21 objection.
22 MR. ODIM: Standing objection.
23 MR. DiCIANNI: I acknowledge a standing
24 objection to this line of questioning.

Page 44

1 MR. ODIM: Okay.
2 MR. DiCIANNI: Could you read back the
3 question.
4 (WHEREUPON, the record was read by
5 the reporter.)
6 BY THE WITNESS:
7 A. I would have to reconsider those
8 opinions.
9 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
10 Q. Now, in part five you explain your
11 opinion on why the security video, you call it the
12 surveillance video, same thing, refutes Officer
13 Hill's testimony that Justus Howell turned at some
14 point during the chase; is that correct?
15 **A. Yes.**
16 Q. You say you don't see a turn in the
17 video, at least when Officer Hill says he saw the
18 turn, you don't see a turn there; is that correct?
19 A. That's right.
20 Q. That's right around 257, correct?
21 **A. Yes.**
22 Q. I want to talk about what expertise you
23 employ in watching a video.
24 Can't a jury make the same judgment

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
45-48

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p> <p>1 that you made as to whether there's a turn or not?</p> <p>2 MR. ODIM: Objection, speculation about what</p> <p>3 a jury can do. He's not a jury.</p> <p>4 BY MR. DiCIANNI:</p> <p>5 Q. Go ahead.</p> <p>6 A. I'm sure a jury can see the video and</p> <p>7 see what's in the video whereas I'm looking in the</p> <p>8 video and I'm looking at details of time, motion</p> <p>9 and distance. I'm looking at postures and</p> <p>10 orientation. I'm looking at how a person is</p> <p>11 holding a gun, how a victim is positioned. I'm</p> <p>12 referring back to the autopsy findings what the</p> <p>13 trajectory was. I'm placing everything together</p> <p>14 in the totality of the circumstances and utilizing</p> <p>15 expertise in shooting reconstruction, trajectory</p> <p>16 analysis, and placing that into the perspective to</p> <p>17 draw scientific interpretations from it.</p> <p>18 Q. So are you saying that your opinion in</p> <p>19 part five that Hill's description of how turning</p> <p>20 at about frame 257 is not based on merely the</p> <p>21 review of the video, but it also incorporates what</p> <p>22 you know from the autopsy findings and other</p> <p>23 source material; is that correct?</p> <p>24 A. I don't think I understand what you're</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p> <p>1 into part five without expressing them?</p> <p>2 A. Correct.</p> <p>3 Q. How do you -- you're aware that other</p> <p>4 people besides Hill did see a turn at 257? Are</p> <p>5 you aware of that?</p> <p>6 A. I'm not.</p> <p>7 Q. Would you agree that not having the</p> <p>8 knowledge of the autopsy findings as you did</p> <p>9 reasonable people could disagree that 257 doesn't</p> <p>10 show a turn?</p> <p>11 MR. ODIM: Objection. Speculation.</p> <p>12 BY THE WITNESS:</p> <p>13 A. I don't know what other reasonable</p> <p>14 people could determine, but they could reach their</p> <p>15 own conclusion.</p> <p>16 BY MR. DiCIANNI:</p> <p>17 Q. Certainly, right.</p> <p>18 A. Sure.</p> <p>19 Q. And without the knowledge of the</p> <p>20 autopsy and the application of that knowledge to</p> <p>21 your interpretation of the video, you would not</p> <p>22 conclude merely by looking at the video that at</p> <p>23 257 Justus Howell did not turn?</p> <p>24 A. Once again, please.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 46</p> <p>1 asking there.</p> <p>2 Q. My question is what science are you</p> <p>3 applying when you tell us that you can tell what's</p> <p>4 on a video better than the average person and you</p> <p>5 said you're also incorporating your knowledge of</p> <p>6 what was discovered at the autopsy.</p> <p>7 So my follow-up question is you're not</p> <p>8 saying from the video alone you could tell that</p> <p>9 Hill did not turn at or around 257; you're saying</p> <p>10 that based on the video plus other information</p> <p>11 that you gained in reviewing the file you conclude</p> <p>12 that he didn't turn at 257?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. So it's not the video alone that leads</p> <p>15 you to the conclusion that he didn't turn at 257,</p> <p>16 correct?</p> <p>17 A. That's a fair statement.</p> <p>18 Q. That's different from what your report</p> <p>19 says, correct?</p> <p>20 A. I don't believe it is.</p> <p>21 Q. Well, in part five you don't reference</p> <p>22 any autopsy findings, right?</p> <p>23 A. Not in part five.</p> <p>24 Q. So you're imputing the autopsy findings</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p> <p>1 MR. DiCIANNI: Would you read it back.</p> <p>2 (WHEREUPON, the record was read by</p> <p>3 the reporter.)</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: Please once again.</p> <p>5 (WHEREUPON, the record was read by</p> <p>6 the reporter.)</p> <p>7 BY THE WITNESS:</p> <p>8 A. Well, I think it's just looking at the</p> <p>9 video at that point comparing it to Officer Hill's</p> <p>10 demonstration at the deposition.</p> <p>11 BY MR. DiCIANNI:</p> <p>12 Q. So you're saying looking at the video,</p> <p>13 you are -- looking at the video alone allows you</p> <p>14 to say based on your shooting reconstruction</p> <p>15 expertise that Justus Howell did not turn in the</p> <p>16 way that Hill described it at 257, correct?</p> <p>17 A. That's not quite accurate. That's not</p> <p>18 what I said.</p> <p>19 Q. Correct me.</p> <p>20 A. How Officer Hill demonstrated at his</p> <p>21 deposition and his relationship in regards to the</p> <p>22 positioning, where he was in relation to the</p> <p>23 direction they were both moving at the time and</p> <p>24 how Mr. Howell turned at 257 and it was at that</p>

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
49-52

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 49</p> <p>1 point that he saw certain aspects of Mr. Howell's</p> <p>2 activities. When I compare that to the video, I</p> <p>3 did not see what Officer Hill is testifying to.</p> <p>4 Q. You're not looking at it from the same</p> <p>5 perspective, correct?</p> <p>6 A. I'm looking at what Officer Hill is</p> <p>7 testifying to and looking at the same frame and</p> <p>8 I'm not seeing what he's describing nor do I see</p> <p>9 what he physically demonstrated.</p> <p>10 Q. But you're not looking at it from his</p> <p>11 perspective, are you?</p> <p>12 MR. ODIM: Objection. Foundation.</p> <p>13 BY THE WITNESS:</p> <p>14 A. I'm looking at the video for what it</p> <p>15 is. I'm looking at Officer Hill's demonstration</p> <p>16 and I'm reading his transcript, and I do not see</p> <p>17 agreement between the video and his deposition</p> <p>18 testimony and his demonstrative exhibit.</p> <p>19 BY MR. DiCIANNI:</p> <p>20 Q. You can arrive at that conclusion even</p> <p>21 without applying the knowledge that you have from</p> <p>22 the autopsy findings?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. So you can't rule out that Justus</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 51</p> <p>1 and elbow is silhouetted against the White</p> <p>2 residence and is shown to be in front of and to</p> <p>3 the right of his torso and at a right angle to the</p> <p>4 ground plane. In frame 256 Justus Howell's right</p> <p>5 arm from his shoulder to his hand is positioned</p> <p>6 nearly straight downward toward the grounds and</p> <p>7 slightly out front of his body and this continues</p> <p>8 to frame 257."</p> <p>9 So my question was you conclude that</p> <p>10 Howell didn't turn the way Hill described it by</p> <p>11 comparing 256 to 257?</p> <p>12 A. That's correct.</p> <p>13 Q. I don't mean to beat a dead horse.</p> <p>14 You're refuting Hill's description of</p> <p>15 the turn merely based on the video?</p> <p>16 MR. ODIM: Objection. That's not his</p> <p>17 testimony.</p> <p>18 MR. DiCIANNI: I think it was.</p> <p>19 BY MR. DiCIANNI:</p> <p>20 Q. Is that correct? You can answer. He</p> <p>21 can object, but he's not telling you not to</p> <p>22 answer.</p> <p>23 A. I didn't know if the objection was</p> <p>24 finished.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 50</p> <p>1 Howell made some kind of a turn at 257 without</p> <p>2 applying the autopsy findings but what you can say</p> <p>3 is that he didn't turn in the way Hill described</p> <p>4 it; is that correct?</p> <p>5 A. That's a fair statement.</p> <p>6 Q. According to your report, you arrive at</p> <p>7 your conclusion that disputes Hill's description</p> <p>8 of the turn from comparing frame 256 to 257; am I</p> <p>9 reading that correctly?</p> <p>10 A. What page, please?</p> <p>11 Q. It's Page 10.</p> <p>12 A. Any specific area or the whole page?</p> <p>13 Q. I'll read it. This would be the second</p> <p>14 paragraph under B, little i: "Frame 257 depicts</p> <p>15 Officer Hill located just off the concretes</p> <p>16 walkway which is in front of the Spaeth's building</p> <p>17 and it shows Officer Hill has stepped onto the</p> <p>18 asphalt driveway surface while Howell is running</p> <p>19 south to southeast several feet before reaching</p> <p>20 the tree in the front yard of the White residence</p> <p>21 at frame 257, and multiple frames preceding this</p> <p>22 clearly show that Justus Howell was constantly</p> <p>23 facing forward in the direction that he is moving.</p> <p>24 His right brachium and upper arm between shoulder</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 52</p> <p>1 Yes. It's my review of the video at</p> <p>2 that frame in comparison to Officer Hill's</p> <p>3 testimony at that very same frame.</p> <p>4 Q. I want to ask you about the science</p> <p>5 of -- forensic science aspect of looking at a</p> <p>6 video.</p> <p>7 What part of forensic science</p> <p>8 does reviewing a video and interpreting it fall</p> <p>9 under?</p> <p>10 A. Well, there is forensic video experts.</p> <p>11 I'm looking at the detail in the video. I'm</p> <p>12 looking at the motion, the time, postures,</p> <p>13 movement.</p> <p>14 Q. What do forensic video experts do?</p> <p>15 A. They can enhance videos, slow them</p> <p>16 down, create slow motion. I'm not sure exactly</p> <p>17 what it is they can do in totality, but they can</p> <p>18 do things that are above and beyond.</p> <p>19 Q. They can talk about distortions in the</p> <p>20 video from reality, correct?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Caused by the camera, caused by other</p> <p>23 factors, correct; they do that?</p> <p>24 A. I believe so.</p>

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
53-56

Page 53

1 Q. Is there any branch of forensic science
2 that allows somebody to just look at a video, look
3 at how people are moving, timing, sequence and
4 interpret what's going on in that video?
5 A. I'm not sure of a specific branch.
6 Q. Is there any study or any treatise
7 or anything at all you can point me to, any source
8 you can point me to that describes the appropriate
9 use of video in forensic shooting reconstruction?
10 A. There have been some studies placed out
11 on video regarding such as with dash cams or body
12 cameras, bank robberies and the like, which can be
13 used to draw certain data from.
14 Q. If a video shows A shooting B, is an
15 appropriate application of forensic science to
16 testify from looking at that video I could tell
17 that A shot B?
18 A. It's possible.
19 Q. What makes it possible?
20 A. It's possible. You might see a muzzle
21 flash. You might see the person fall down. You
22 could see a cartridge case.
23 Q. As a forensic scientist, you would be
24 explaining areas of forensic science that are

Page 54

1 demonstrated in that video such as muzzle flash?
2 A. That would be one, yes.
3 Q. In the absence of some explanation of
4 some forensic science conclusion in the video, is
5 it appropriate -- is that an appropriate
6 application of forensic science to just say what's
7 on the video?
8 MR. ODIM: Objection. Foundation.
9 Multi-part question.
10 BY THE WITNESS:
11 A. I think we could rely on other
12 information such as medical information.
13 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
14 Q. Okay. I'm not questioning it. I'm
15 just questioning if a video sees A shooting B and
16 there's no question about muzzle flash, is it an
17 appropriate application of forensic science for
18 you to get on the stand and testify from my review
19 of the video, A shot B?
20 A. Additional data is needed.
21 Q. Yes, okay. Additional clarification of
22 what's on the video based on forensic science
23 conclusions; is that correct?
24 A. Yes.

Page 55

1 Q. Otherwise a jury can just -- anybody
2 can just tell A shot B, right. Nevermind.
3 Rhetorical question.
4 A. Okay.
5 Q. Let's take a look at 256 and then 257.
6 MR. ODIM: Tom, let's go off for a quick
7 second.
8 (WHEREUPON, discussion was had off
9 the record.)
10 MR. ODIM: Back on the record.
11 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
12 Q. Take a look at 256 and then let's go to
13 257.
14 You don't see a difference between 256
15 and 257?
16 MR. ODIM: Objection. Is that a question?
17 MR. DiCIANNI: Yes.
18 THE WITNESS: I didn't anticipate the
19 comparison.
20 Can we go back to 256?
21 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
22 Q. Yes. Go back to 256.
23 Now that's 256, and is it your opinion
24 that he's running forward at that point?

Page 56

1 A. Yes, it is.
2 Q. Now let's go to 257. You don't see a
3 difference there?
4 A. I see a difference.
5 Q. Doesn't it look that more of his back
6 is facing the camera than in 256?
7 A. I don't see a significant difference.
8 Q. You don't?
9 A. I do not.
10 Q. Isn't his right arm extended out from
11 his body in 257?
12 A. Yes, it is.
13 Q. Do you see the white right there?
14 A. Yes.
15 Q. That's a gap between his arm and his
16 torso, correct?
17 A. Yes, it is.
18 Q. Isn't that different from 256?
19 A. Yes, it is.
20 Q. But you disagree that that demonstrates
21 a turn in the way that Officer Hill described it?
22 A. That's correct.
23 Q. But you don't disagree that it
24 demonstrates a turn?

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017

57-60

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 57</p> <p>1 A. I don't think it's a turn.</p> <p>2 Q. You don't think it's a turn?</p> <p>3 A. No, I do not.</p> <p>4 Q. Tell me everything you base that</p> <p>5 on.</p> <p>6 A. Mr. Howell is running southeast.</p> <p>7 Officer Howell is moving directly south.</p> <p>8 Q. Officer Hill.</p> <p>9 A. I'm sorry. Officer Hill is moving</p> <p>10 south. So there is an orientation of Mr. Howell</p> <p>11 moving to the southeast in relation to this camera</p> <p>12 that I see that is showing some of his back, but</p> <p>13 not of a result of a turn.</p> <p>14 Q. Well, tell me how does running</p> <p>15 southeast reveal more of his back than what, than</p> <p>16 running straight south?</p> <p>17 A. The camera is facing east. If you look</p> <p>18 at Officer Howell (sic), you'll see that you only</p> <p>19 see his right side because he's facing directly</p> <p>20 south. When I look at Mr. Howell who is running</p> <p>21 southeast, he's running away from the camera at an</p> <p>22 angle and so his back portion is going to be</p> <p>23 showing more to the camera by virtue of the</p> <p>24 compass direction in which he's moving.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p> <p>1 Did you come to that conclusion merely</p> <p>2 by looking at the video?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. What forensic shooting reconstruction</p> <p>5 expertise did you apply in arriving at that</p> <p>6 conclusion?</p> <p>7 A. I'm looking at the contrast of a silver</p> <p>8 or chrome pistol to see that object in this</p> <p>9 victim's hand. I can't see it.</p> <p>10 Q. Are you ruling out that there is a --</p> <p>11 you can't see it, but are you ruling out or are</p> <p>12 you saying that the video demonstrates that he</p> <p>13 doesn't have a gun in his hand?</p> <p>14 A. I'm not saying that.</p> <p>15 Q. You're just saying it can't be seen?</p> <p>16 A. Correct.</p> <p>17 Q. Is the only forensic science principle</p> <p>18 or forensic science conclusion that you're</p> <p>19 applying here to determine that the silver Kimber</p> <p>20 can't be seen in his hand that you don't see any</p> <p>21 reflections?</p> <p>22 A. I don't see any object or reflection.</p> <p>23 Q. Have you done any studies regarding</p> <p>24 what kind of reflection a silver Kimber like this</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 58</p> <p>1 Q. Let's go back to 256.</p> <p>2 So in 5/100ths or 6/100ths of a second,</p> <p>3 merely by running in a southeasterly direction</p> <p>4 more of his back is going to be revealed in those</p> <p>5 two frames?</p> <p>6 A. I don't see any difference in the</p> <p>7 amount of his back.</p> <p>8 Q. You don't?</p> <p>9 A. No, I don't.</p> <p>10 Q. If we were to be able to blow those up</p> <p>11 and do a measurement, a north-south measurement of</p> <p>12 his back that showed a difference in how much of</p> <p>13 his back is facing the camera, would you</p> <p>14 disagree -- would you agree with us then that</p> <p>15 there is a difference in 256 and 257?</p> <p>16 MR. ODIM: Objection. That's inappropriate</p> <p>17 hypothetical.</p> <p>18 BY THE WITNESS:</p> <p>19 A. I would be willing to look at them and</p> <p>20 reconsider.</p> <p>21 BY MR. DICIANNI:</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>23 You go on in part five to say that the</p> <p>24 silver Kimber cannot be seen in the video.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 60</p> <p>1 one would show in a video like this?</p> <p>2 A. Not studies.</p> <p>3 Q. Have you done anything that would</p> <p>4 provide you with some objective evidence that if</p> <p>5 there was a gun in his hand, silver Kimber in his</p> <p>6 hand, some reflection would be seen?</p> <p>7 A. I don't know if I have an actual</p> <p>8 estimate of videos in which people have been</p> <p>9 carrying firearms of different color, but I have</p> <p>10 seen silver-colored firearms.</p> <p>11 Q. Have you seen silver-colored firearms</p> <p>12 in a video that is similar to this one?</p> <p>13 A. Yes, when you say similar, this is</p> <p>14 unique to itself.</p> <p>15 Q. It is unique to itself, isn't it?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. You can't really come to a conclusion</p> <p>18 that he's not carrying a silver Kimber because you</p> <p>19 don't see it in this video based on your review of</p> <p>20 other videos, correct?</p> <p>21 A. Correct.</p> <p>22 Q. What would be some of the other -- some</p> <p>23 of the factors that might affect whether a</p> <p>24 reflection would be shown?</p>

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZIONApril 04, 2017
61-64

Page 61

1 A. Well, I think the best answer I could
2 give to that is I would either see it or I
3 wouldn't see it, and I just can't see it.
4 Q. Would the location of the sun matter?
5 A. Yes.
6 Q. Would the time of the day matter?
7 A. Yes.
8 Q. Would the camera's ability to pick up a
9 reflection and not have that distorted in some way
10 matter?
11 A. I think that's an aspect that could be
12 considered.
13 Q. And you didn't consider any of those
14 factors in this case?
15 A. Well, I've seen other objects in this
16 video that do reflect.
17 Q. Like what?
18 A. Well, we can see the reflection of the
19 window of that motor vehicle parked on the right
20 side. We can see the frame of the window of
21 Spaeth's Woodworking, both the left large window.
22 We can see all these vehicles from the front with
23 the headlights. We can see the chrome. We can
24 see the white house, and in the part of the video

Page 62

1 we'll see Officer Gildea's badge actually flash.
2 Q. That would be a function of a
3 particular light hitting it at that particular
4 time, right?
5 A. I agree.
6 Q. None of which you can say the same type
7 of light would have would have hit the gun in this
8 video?
9 A. All I can see is say is I cannot see a
10 silver object or a reflective object in his hand.
11 Q. You're probably familiar with the gun
12 itself, but you've studied that type of gun?
13 A. I'm familiar with that firearm.
14 Q. How long is it?
15 A. I believe the overall length is about
16 four inches.
17 Q. That's the length?
18 A. It would be from the grip, the bottom
19 part of the grip to the front of the muzzle.
20 Q. How high is it?
21 A. I'd have to look at my notes.
22 Q. Well, from your knowledge? You have
23 notes on that?
24 A. I do.

Page 63

1 Q. I thought you didn't have notes.
2 A. I didn't take notes at the scene. I
3 do --
4 Q. What do you mean?
5 A. I didn't take notes at the scene was
6 the question you'd asked me.
7 Q. No. I asked you if you had any notes.
8 MR. ODIM: Objection. I heard exactly what
9 he told you. You asked him about the scene when
10 he went up to take measurements.
11 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
12 Q. Well, then I'll ask you now.
13 During the course of your study in this
14 case, did you take notes?
15 A. I printed out reference material.
16 Q. Did you take notes?
17 A. Written notes?
18 Q. Yes.
19 A. No.
20 Q. So you have some reference material
21 that on the silver Kimber?
22 A. Yes.
23 Q. And that's what you would refer to?
24 A. Yes.

Page 64

1 Q. And apart from looking at that right
2 now, you can't tell me the height of the gun?
3 A. Given that it's an estimate,
4 approximately three to three-and-a-half inches.
5 Q. It's a tiny gun, right?
6 A. It's very small.
7 Q. Justus had big hands, right?
8 MR. ODIM: Objection. Foundation.
9 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
10 Q. Did you look at the autopsy photographs
11 to determine whether Justus's hands -- how much of
12 the gun would have been shielded from any light
13 that might reflect off of it by --
14 MR. ODIM: Objection, foundation again.
15 Sorry.
16 MR. DiCIANNI: I'm asking if he did it.
17 Objection foundation? What do you mean objection
18 foundation? I'm asking him if he did something.
19 What foundation do you want for that?
20 MR. ODIM: How about the measurement of his
21 hands?
22 MR. DiCIANNI: That's what I'm asking him.
23 MR. ODIM: How --
24 MR. DiCIANNI: I'm asking him if he did it --

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017

65-68

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p> <p>1 all right. Let's take a break.</p> <p>2 MR. ODIM: Okay. Let's do that.</p> <p>3 (WHEREUPON, a recess was had.)</p> <p>4 MR. DiCIANNI: Could you read back the last</p> <p>5 question.</p> <p>6 (WHEREUPON, the record was read by</p> <p>7 the reporter.)</p> <p>8 BY MR. DiCIANNI:</p> <p>9 Q. You can answer.</p> <p>10 A. I did not. I would have hoped that</p> <p>11 would have been done at the autopsy by the</p> <p>12 officers, but I haven't read any source materials</p> <p>13 to that effect.</p> <p>14 Q. You would hope that they would do it in</p> <p>15 the investigation to confirm or refute the</p> <p>16 testimony by Hill that Howell was carrying a gun,</p> <p>17 right?</p> <p>18 A. Officer Hill described and demonstrated</p> <p>19 how it was done. Certainly I think that could</p> <p>20 have been done at the autopsy.</p> <p>21 Q. What I'm referring to is you wish the</p> <p>22 investigation had done something to either confirm</p> <p>23 or refute that Howell was carrying a gun based on</p> <p>24 a lack of reflection in the video; is that what</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 67</p> <p>1 BY THE WITNESS:</p> <p>2 A. That I did not see the gun?</p> <p>3 BY MR. DiCIANNI:</p> <p>4 Q. Yes.</p> <p>5 A. Well, if I saw the gun I would report</p> <p>6 it. I'm reporting what I can see and what I</p> <p>7 cannot see that's an important aspect of this</p> <p>8 shooting.</p> <p>9 Q. Whether you can see a gun in Howell's</p> <p>10 hand in the video doesn't affect your opinion on</p> <p>11 whether he turned or not, right?</p> <p>12 A. Correct.</p> <p>13 Q. And it doesn't affect your opinions on</p> <p>14 the positioning of the two people at the time the</p> <p>15 shots were fired, right?</p> <p>16 A. I agree.</p> <p>17 Q. And it doesn't affect your opinion</p> <p>18 regarding your disagreement with when Hill fired</p> <p>19 the shots, correct?</p> <p>20 A. Correct.</p> <p>21 Q. So what significance does it have to</p> <p>22 your opinions? It's just an independent opinion?</p> <p>23 A. I'm reporting what I see. In this case</p> <p>24 I'm reporting what I don't see. I would report</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p> <p>1 you're saying?</p> <p>2 MR. ODIM: Objection. That was not his</p> <p>3 testimony.</p> <p>4 BY THE WITNESS:</p> <p>5 A. I don't agree with the term refute.</p> <p>6 What I would like to see is there is a version of</p> <p>7 events, a simple matter of placing the gun with</p> <p>8 the precautions, of course, not to transfer DNA</p> <p>9 and in the person's hands and taking some</p> <p>10 photographs and document what it would look like</p> <p>11 according to the way Officer Hill described. That</p> <p>12 would have been appropriate to do.</p> <p>13 BY MR. DiCIANNI:</p> <p>14 Q. What significance does the opinion that</p> <p>15 you can't see the gun in Howell's hand have on</p> <p>16 your opinions in this case?</p> <p>17 MR. ODIM: Objection. Misstates the</p> <p>18 evidence. There's no testimony that there was a</p> <p>19 gun in his hand.</p> <p>20 MR. DiCIANNI: Would you read back the</p> <p>21 question.</p> <p>22 (WHEREUPON, the record was read by</p> <p>23 the reporter.)</p> <p>24 MR. ODIM: Sorry.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 68</p> <p>1 either or.</p> <p>2 Q. You could report a lot of things that</p> <p>3 you see or don't see, but you chose to report that</p> <p>4 particular one.</p> <p>5 Why is that significant to your</p> <p>6 opinion?</p> <p>7 MR. ODIM: I object. You've been beating</p> <p>8 this dead horse. He had has not been asked to</p> <p>9 give an opinion about the existence of this gun or</p> <p>10 nonexistence. So it's outside the task that he</p> <p>11 was given.</p> <p>12 BY MR. DiCIANNI:</p> <p>13 Q. So you weren't asked to give an opinion</p> <p>14 on whether Howell is carrying a gun.</p> <p>15 Why did you render an opinion on</p> <p>16 whether the video shows Howell carrying a gun?</p> <p>17 A. I can see Officer Hill's gun.</p> <p>18 Q. That's a different question.</p> <p>19 A. I can see a gun. I can't see a silver</p> <p>20 object or metallic object in the hands of</p> <p>21 Mr. Howell.</p> <p>22 Q. That opinion that you can't see a gun</p> <p>23 in his hand in the video doesn't have any</p> <p>24 relevance to any of the other opinions that we've</p>

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
69-72

Page 69

1 discussed; counsel has just said on the record
2 that you weren't asked to give that opinion.
3 Are you only giving that opinion as
4 a means of attempting to attack Hill's
5 credibility?
6 A. No.
7 Q. Doesn't the fact that you gave an
8 opinion that's contrary to Hill's testimony and
9 you that you weren't even asked to give, doesn't
10 that indicate a bias on your part against Officer
11 Hill?
12 A. Not at all.
13 Q. You disagree?
14 A. I disagree. Strongly disagree.
15 Q. Why didn't you discuss any of the
16 factors in your report that could have prevented
17 you from seeing a gun even if he was carrying it?
18 A. I don't understand that question.
19 Q. We talked about Howell if he had big
20 hands, it could have completely covered the gun
21 from any light might have reflected off of it,
22 correct?
23 A. Correct.
24 Q. Okay. And you didn't do any reflection

Page 70

1 tests on this kind of a gun, correct?
2 A. Correct.
3 Q. It's a small gun, correct?
4 A. It's a small gun.
5 Q. Why didn't you include -- it doesn't
6 really have a sharp silver -- it's sort of a matte
7 finish, isn't it?
8 A. Yes.
9 Q. It's a brushed silver kind of?
10 A. It's not shiny.
11 Q. You say in your report that I can't see
12 a gun in his hand, but you don't discuss any of
13 the factors that could have prevented you from
14 seeing a gun if he had gun.
15 Why not?
16 A. I certainly have some thoughts as to
17 why I can't see a gun.
18 Q. Why wouldn't you put that in your
19 report?
20 A. Because there's other possibilities.
21 Q. Well, there is a possibility that any
22 one of those factors or all of those factors that
23 I just mentioned could have prevented the
24 reflection of a gun in the video, correct?

Page 71

1 A. That's one aspect, correct.
2 Q. All right. And wouldn't it be a
3 thorough forensic evaluation to also say I don't
4 see a gun, however, there are reasons why I might
5 not see a gun and list some of those factors?
6 Wouldn't that be a thorough forensic evaluation to
7 make?
8 A. I think that opens that up to
9 possibilities that could go -- endless
10 possibilities. What I can't see is I cannot see a
11 gun. That's my conclusion from looking at the
12 video.
13 Q. Right, but there are forensic
14 evaluation as that have to be made that could
15 explain a disagreement between what's shown on the
16 video and what somebody testified to, right?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. That's what you're supposed to do in a
19 forensic evaluation, correct?
20 A. Not necessarily.
21 Q. Not necessarily unless your mission is
22 to refute somebody's testimony as opposed to
23 independently making an evaluation, right?
24 A. Again, you're using the term refute

Page 72

1 testimony, and that's not role in this case.
2 My role in this case is to look at the
3 evidence as I see it. If it agrees with the
4 testimony, that's fine. If it refutes it, that's
5 the way it is.
6 Q. You didn't see anything that could be
7 interpreted as a gun in Howell's hand?
8 A. I did not.
9 Q. What about the way he's running? Does
10 that suggest to you he's carrying something in his
11 right hand?
12 A. I can't tell.
13 Q. You say yourself in your report that
14 when he's running for the most part his right arm
15 is down facing the ground, right?
16 A. I can see the -- yes.
17 Q. Not facing the ground, extended towards
18 the ground?
19 A. From the brachium, shoulder to the
20 elbow, I can see that.
21 Q. Okay. And when people run, normally
22 they run with their arms rotating back and forth?
23 MR. ODIM: Objection, foundation.
24 BY MR. DiCIANNI:

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZIONApril 04, 2017
73-76

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 73</p> <p>1 Q. Well, I'm asking you.</p> <p>2 A. Normally.</p> <p>3 Q. Wouldn't it suggest to you that he's</p> <p>4 running with his right arm down as opposed to</p> <p>5 rotating back and forth that he's carrying</p> <p>6 something in his right hand?</p> <p>7 A. It's possible.</p> <p>8 Q. Why didn't you consider that, though,</p> <p>9 in your report?</p> <p>10 A. Well, I can't see anything in the</p> <p>11 video.</p> <p>12 Q. Well, I know, but there's other</p> <p>13 explanations for why you can't see anything and</p> <p>14 there's something else that could suggest that he</p> <p>15 is carrying something in his right hand, none of</p> <p>16 which you put in your report?</p> <p>17 A. I did not say in my report that he's</p> <p>18 not carrying anything.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. All right. You agree with</p> <p>20 counsel that you were not asked to talk about</p> <p>21 whether he had a gun in his right hand or whether</p> <p>22 the video shows that he has a gun in his right</p> <p>23 hand, correct?</p> <p>24 A. Once again.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 75</p> <p>1 that's to the right of it.</p> <p>2 Couldn't that be a reflection off his</p> <p>3 gun?</p> <p>4 A. I don't see that.</p> <p>5 Q. Why not?</p> <p>6 A. I see a vertical fence post.</p> <p>7 Q. Next to the fence post, you don't see</p> <p>8 the white dot?</p> <p>9 A. I see the two white dots which indicate</p> <p>10 to me that it's his pants legs.</p> <p>11 Q. You think that's his pants leg?</p> <p>12 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>13 Q. If his arm was extended all the way</p> <p>14 down, that's where his right hand would be,</p> <p>15 wouldn't it?</p> <p>16 A. I don't see his right hand.</p> <p>17 Q. I know, but if it were extended down</p> <p>18 all the way, that's about where or almost exactly</p> <p>19 where his right hand would be, correct?</p> <p>20 A. If it's there, it's blocked by that</p> <p>21 vertical post.</p> <p>22 Q. If what's there it's blocked by the</p> <p>23 vertical post.</p> <p>24 A. His arm and hand.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 74</p> <p>1 Q. You agree with counsel who said that</p> <p>2 you weren't even asked to evaluate whether the</p> <p>3 video shows that he has a gun in his right hand?</p> <p>4 A. Counsel never asked me to look for a</p> <p>5 gun.</p> <p>6 Q. You do say you can see a gun in Officer</p> <p>7 Hill's hand?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Before I get into that, let's show 212</p> <p>10 to 214 and then we'll -- one at a time.</p> <p>11 213, you see where his right arm should</p> <p>12 be located, you can't see it completely because of</p> <p>13 the fence in the way, but the white little dot</p> <p>14 here below the -- about two thirds of the way up</p> <p>15 from the bottom fence post, that's not a post,</p> <p>16 what do you call the vertical --</p> <p>17 A. That's actually the sidewalk you're</p> <p>18 pointing to.</p> <p>19 Q. That's the sidewalk? You think that's</p> <p>20 the sidewalk?</p> <p>21 A. This is the sidewalk right here.</p> <p>22 Q. That's the sidewalk, but I'm referring</p> <p>23 to this right here. That's above the sidewalk.</p> <p>24 That's about the height of the middle of this car</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 76</p> <p>1 Q. His arm. Well, couldn't this brown</p> <p>2 part here or the colored part, I can't know the</p> <p>3 color exactly, that's actually his right arm,</p> <p>4 isn't it? And I'm referring to are the colored</p> <p>5 figure in the frame that begins just above the</p> <p>6 horizontal post and comes down to just below the</p> <p>7 horizontal post, it that's his right arm, isn't</p> <p>8 it?</p> <p>9 A. There's also a tree there so I can't</p> <p>10 tell whether that's part of the tree.</p> <p>11 Q. Part of the tree?</p> <p>12 A. That's a tree.</p> <p>13 Q. There's something white in the tree</p> <p>14 like a dove?</p> <p>15 A. If you could point out to me exactly</p> <p>16 what it is you're referring to.</p> <p>17 Q. Yes. I'm referring to this right here.</p> <p>18 MS. MORAN: You're putting your glasses up</p> <p>19 there. Why don't you use a pointer. It's a</p> <p>20 little unclear of exactly what you're pointing to.</p> <p>21 BY MR. DiCIANNI:</p> <p>22 Q. I don't have a pointer. I'll use my</p> <p>23 pen. Right there.</p> <p>24 Do you see where I'm pointing to?</p>

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017

77-80

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 77</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Why would you rule out that that's a</p> <p>3 the reflection of a gun?</p> <p>4 A. I don't see the shape of a gun and I do</p> <p>5 not see the skin of a hand of Mr. Howell in that</p> <p>6 frame.</p> <p>7 Q. Well, you can't see his hand or skin in</p> <p>8 any frames, right?</p> <p>9 A. I would have to go through them frame</p> <p>10 by frame, but in this frame I do not see his arm</p> <p>11 or his hand or a gun in that frame.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. So let's talk about your opinion</p> <p>13 that you could see the gun in Hill's hand and</p> <p>14 you're only pointing that out because you think</p> <p>15 that if you could see it in Hill's hand, we should</p> <p>16 be able to see it in Howell's hand; is that</p> <p>17 correct?</p> <p>18 A. There's an additional aspect to that.</p> <p>19 Q. What is that?</p> <p>20 A. Officer Hill testified that he did not</p> <p>21 withdraw his firearm from his holster until he had</p> <p>22 reached the driveway.</p> <p>23 My viewing of this video shows that he</p> <p>24 withdraw his firearm as he rounded that corner and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 79</p> <p>1 hand, but also for another purpose?</p> <p>2 A. What page, please?</p> <p>3 Q. Page 11.</p> <p>4 A. With regards to the question, the</p> <p>5 purpose is to point out what I see.</p> <p>6 Q. What you saw was something that was</p> <p>7 inconsistent with what you thought his testimony</p> <p>8 was when you point out where Hill has a gun in his</p> <p>9 hand?</p> <p>10 A. It's not what I think was inconsistent.</p> <p>11 It's what I know was inconsistent.</p> <p>12 Q. You deny that you're bringing these</p> <p>13 things to light in your report merely to impeach</p> <p>14 Officer Hill?</p> <p>15 A. Yes. I deny that.</p> <p>16 Q. You deny that. You deny that you have</p> <p>17 any bias against Officer Hill?</p> <p>18 A. Absolutely deny that strongly.</p> <p>19 Q. You deny that you have any advocacy</p> <p>20 here for the plaintiff?</p> <p>21 A. That's correct.</p> <p>22 Q. You say that this is a completely</p> <p>23 independent, full and thorough forensic</p> <p>24 evaluation?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 78</p> <p>1 went behind the tree.</p> <p>2 Q. Why is that important?</p> <p>3 A. Because his testimony was that he did</p> <p>4 not withdraw his firearm until he had reached the</p> <p>5 driveway.</p> <p>6 Q. So you're just wanting to point out</p> <p>7 discrepancies in his testimony whether it's</p> <p>8 relevant to an opinion or not? That's what you're</p> <p>9 doing?</p> <p>10 A. There's other information in his</p> <p>11 deposition and his statement in which he stated</p> <p>12 that he did not point the gun at Mr. Howell until</p> <p>13 he had reached the driveway, and from the video, I</p> <p>14 see a different version of events.</p> <p>15 Q. That's really not relevant to any of</p> <p>16 your opinions, though, is it?</p> <p>17 A. I'm looking at a shooting</p> <p>18 reconstruction. At what point did a person have a</p> <p>19 firearm in his hand whether it be Howell or</p> <p>20 Officer Hill.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. So you're wanting to point out</p> <p>22 in Section 5 ii that you could see the gun in</p> <p>23 Hill's hand is put there not only to support your</p> <p>24 view that the video doesn't show a gun in Howell's</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 80</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Let's show 240. You say that in your</p> <p>3 report Page 11 you say that in frames 240, 252,</p> <p>4 257, 264, 270 and 275 you can clearly see Officer</p> <p>5 Hill's pistol, correct?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. We know Officer Hill had a pistol in</p> <p>8 his hand. There's no disputing that, correct?</p> <p>9 A. Well, I can see it, and that's what I</p> <p>10 reported.</p> <p>11 Q. No, I know.</p> <p>12 So you're saying that independent of</p> <p>13 our knowledge that he was holding a gun, you can</p> <p>14 see a gun?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. I'm going to ask you to show me in 240</p> <p>17 where you see a gun. Do you want the pointer?</p> <p>18 Eventually we'll use the photographs for this.</p> <p>19 Let's start with you showing me exactly where you</p> <p>20 see a gun in his hand.</p> <p>21 A. You see a black outline right here,</p> <p>22 which can be enhanced in this software.</p> <p>23 Q. Did you enhance it?</p> <p>24 A. I did.</p>

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZIONApril 04, 2017
81-84

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 81</p> <p>1 Q. You did?</p> <p>2 A. Sure.</p> <p>3 Q. So you know how to enhance it right</p> <p>4 now?</p> <p>5 A. I could try.</p> <p>6 Q. Let's do it.</p> <p>7 A. What I'd like to say is I don't know</p> <p>8 what the resolution is on this screen, but it's</p> <p>9 different than the monitor that I use on my</p> <p>10 computer so it's not going to be as clear. I</p> <p>11 think this is about as good as I'm going to get.</p> <p>12 Q. Well, that's better. Although maybe --</p> <p>13 it's sharper but a little blurrier.</p> <p>14 A. A little blurrier, but I can see and it</p> <p>15 kind of blends in with the line under the window,</p> <p>16 but there's a black object in his hand.</p> <p>17 Q. A black object in his hand? It extends</p> <p>18 from here to here?</p> <p>19 A. Well, again, the resolution on this is</p> <p>20 not what I see on my computer. I don't know what</p> <p>21 the resolution would be, but it's clear not as</p> <p>22 defined as my monitor.</p> <p>23 Q. So your monitor shows something</p> <p>24 different from what my monitor shows?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 83</p> <p>1 MR. DiCIANNI: It's frame 240. We didn't</p> <p>2 number the pages, but they're in order.</p> <p>3 BY THE WITNESS:</p> <p>4 A. Not from the photographs.</p> <p>5 BY MR. DiCIANNI:</p> <p>6 Q. You're saying the resolution on these</p> <p>7 is not good enough?</p> <p>8 A. Very poor.</p> <p>9 Q. But on yours you can enhance?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. And if you were to print from your set</p> <p>12 that you have at your computer at home, would it</p> <p>13 be as clear as you're seeing on your monitor?</p> <p>14 A. No, it would not.</p> <p>15 Q. So the only place that we would be able</p> <p>16 to see what you see is if we all came to your home</p> <p>17 in Phoenix and looked at your monitor?</p> <p>18 A. Or a similar monitor, yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Well, what is that? What was</p> <p>20 the monitor that you used? It wasn't the computer</p> <p>21 you used; it's the monitor that made the</p> <p>22 difference?</p> <p>23 A. Well, combination of both, of course,</p> <p>24 and graphics, the graphics, of course.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 82</p> <p>1 A. I think the resolution on my monitor is</p> <p>2 significantly greater quality.</p> <p>3 Q. Did you run off any photos from your</p> <p>4 monitor that would show us the better quality?</p> <p>5 A. I did not.</p> <p>6 Q. Do you have your monitor with you?</p> <p>7 A. I didn't use the PC that I have with</p> <p>8 me.</p> <p>9 Q. Let's go back to the way it was. This</p> <p>10 is sharper but it's blurrier so let's go back to</p> <p>11 the way it was.</p> <p>12 A. Uncheck the image adjust.</p> <p>13 Q. That's back to what it was?</p> <p>14 A. Right.</p> <p>15 MR. DiCIANNI: Let's mark this as Exhibit 2.</p> <p>16 (WHEREUPON, a certain document was</p> <p>17 marked Scott Deposition Exhibit</p> <p>18 No. 2 for identification, as of</p> <p>19 04/04/2017.)</p> <p>20 BY MR. DiCIANNI:</p> <p>21 Q. Let me ask you to turn to frame 240. I</p> <p>22 might know what you're going to say about this but</p> <p>23 can you see the gun in this photo?</p> <p>24 MR. ODIM: What page?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 84</p> <p>1 Q. Tell us what it was.</p> <p>2 A. I have two monitors. Let's see. One</p> <p>3 is an LG monitor, 27-inch. I forget the model.</p> <p>4 The other one is a Samsung. Again, I don't know</p> <p>5 the model. It's a 28-inch.</p> <p>6 Q. So that doesn't help us too much.</p> <p>7 MR. DiCIANNI: I'm going to move that we</p> <p>8 adjourn this meeting to Phoenix, Arizona to your</p> <p>9 home.</p> <p>10 MR. ODIM: Of course at your expense.</p> <p>11 MR. DiCIANNI: I can't promise that.</p> <p>12 BY MR. DiCIANNI:</p> <p>13 Q. I assume that's something you wouldn't</p> <p>14 be able to show in a courtroom, then, right?</p> <p>15 A. I assume I would have to bring my</p> <p>16 computer and my monitor.</p> <p>17 Q. So if you were to bring your computer</p> <p>18 and your monitor to the courthouse and hook it up,</p> <p>19 it would show us a clear view of the gun in Hill's</p> <p>20 hand?</p> <p>21 A. I can't speak for what anybody else can</p> <p>22 see. I can speak to what I can see.</p> <p>23 Q. And you clearly see a gun in his</p> <p>24 hand?</p>

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
85-88

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 85</p> <p>1 A. I clearly see a firearm, a black 2 firearm. 3 Q. We know there's a gun in the hand. 4 There's no disputing that, but you can clearly see 5 a gun in the hand? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. If I ask you in court to get up and 8 draw the outline of that gun on some exhibit 9 from your good monitor, you would be able to do 10 that? 11 MR. ODIM: Objection. Now you're arguing 12 with him. 13 MR. DiCIANNI: I'm not arguing. 14 MR. ODIM: And badgering him. He's made it 15 clear in this room on your monitor enhancing your 16 image that the outline of the gun is present. 17 You're badgering him. 18 BY MR. DiCIANNI: 19 Q. No, I don't think I'm -- are you 20 feeling badgered? You're not feeling badgered, 21 are you? 22 MR. ODIM: I think you should just move on. 23 BY THE WITNESS: 24 A. I'm not going to get involved in</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 87</p> <p>1 correct? 2 A. Well, I'm saying that it's not how 3 he testified. It's how he demonstrated in 4 deposition Exhibit 21. 5 Q. You would agree with me that a 6 demonstration by a witness on a witness stand is a 7 questionable piece of forensic evidence, correct? 8 MR. ODIM: Objection. Foundation. 9 BY THE WITNESS: 10 A. I would not agree with that. 11 BY MR. DiCIANNI: 12 Q. You would not agree with that? 13 A. No. 14 Q. So you think that a person who 15 testifies about an event in a highly charged 16 conflicted possibly life-threatening situation 17 would be able to perfectly replicate on the 18 witness stand a position of a person by 19 demonstration? 20 MR. ODIM: Again, objection. Foundation. 21 Multi-part question, and it's ambiguous. 22 BY THE WITNESS: 23 A. I think if he couldn't he could say so 24 and say I can't do it.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 86</p> <p>1 attorneys's debates. 2 BY MR. DiCIANNI: 3 Q. You've testified a lot. You're 4 comfortable. 5 You wouldn't let me badger you, would 6 you? 7 A. I've been badgered. 8 Q. It doesn't affect you, right? 9 A. I answer the questions as best I 10 can. 11 Q. I have a question. Are you feeling 12 badgered right now? 13 A. No, not necessarily. 14 Q. Thank you. 15 So your next opinion now relates to the 16 gunshot wound entrance angles, correct? 17 A. Item C, correct. 18 Q. If I understand the opinion correctly, 19 you say that based on both Officer Hill's 20 testimony regarding the positioning of he and 21 Howell and the autopsy angles, the autopsy bullet 22 hole angle measurements, you disagree that Howell 23 was turned in the way that Officer Hill said he 24 was at the time that Officer Hill fired; is that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 88</p> <p>1 BY MR. DiCIANNI: 2 Q. Well, he could do his best and wouldn't 3 you expect him to do his best? 4 A. I'm sorry? 5 Q. Wouldn't you expect him as he's 6 testifying to do the best he can to replicate the 7 position that he's asked to replicate? 8 MR. ODIM: Objection. Speculation. You're 9 asking this witness to put himself in the shoes of 10 someone else. He has no idea his thought process. 11 BY THE WITNESS: 12 A. I'm looking at the demonstration that 13 he did, and that's what I'm using. 14 BY MR. DiCIANNI: 15 Q. Okay. And my question goes to the 16 validity of basing a forensic evaluation on that 17 type of testimony; you say that it's valid? 18 A. That's the demonstration that he gave 19 under oath. That's the exhibit that I utilized. 20 Q. So that's what you're refuting, what he 21 demonstrated at the deposition? 22 MR. ODIM: Objection. That was not his 23 testimony. 24 MR. DiCIANNI: I thought it was.</p>

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZIONApril 04, 2017
89-92

Page 89

1 BY THE WITNESS:
2 A. I don't think I understand that
3 question.
4 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
5 Q. Let's back up.
6 Your opinion number C beginning on
7 Page 11 disputes the positions of Hill and Howell
8 based on Hill's testimony and based on autopsy
9 findings, correct?
10 A. That's two of the factors, correct.
11 Q. And you're disputing that Howell was in
12 the position that Hill demonstrated at his
13 deposition when Hill shot?
14 A. I lost you.
15 Q. Let me say it again.
16 You're disputing that Justus -- I'm
17 going to say Justus instead of Howell, okay.
18 You're disputing that Justus was in the
19 position that Hill described him in at the time
20 that Hill shot based on both Hill's testimony and
21 based on the autopsy findings, right?
22 A. And based upon the video.
23 Q. Well, right. And that's what you're
24 disputing, correct? You're disputing that Justus

Page 90

1 was in the position that Hill demonstrated in the
2 video when Hill shot?
3 A. Correct.
4 Q. Thank you. And one of the bases for
5 that is the angle that Hill describes between the
6 two of them at the time at the time that he shot,
7 right?
8 A. Yes.
9 Q. And that's the one o'clock/two o'clock
10 thing, right?
11 A. Yes.
12 Q. And the angle that you believe that
13 would demonstrate would be a 30 to 60-degree
14 angle, right?
15 A. Yes, that's correct.
16 Q. With 90-degree being at three o'clock?
17 A. That's correct.
18 Q. So that angle would have Hill at the
19 vertex?
20 A. I'm sorry?
21 Q. Hill would be at the vertex of the
22 angle?
23 A. Approximately, between two and three --
24 one to two o'clock I believe was the testimony.

Page 91

1 Q. Yes, but we're talking about the angle
2 itself. Let's forget the clock for a minute.
3 The angle of 30 degrees to 60 degrees,
4 Hill is at the vertex, right?
5 A. Now you're talking about an arc.
6 Q. No. I'm talking about an angle, not an
7 arc.
8 A. I think I've lost you on -- because I'm
9 going by the face of a clock.
10 Q. Okay. So Hill is in the middle where
11 the hands are attached to the clock?
12 A. Correct, yes.
13 Q. So that's the vertex of the angle,
14 right?
15 A. Okay, right.
16 Q. Okay. And the line segment, one line
17 segment is where Justus is standing, right?
18 A. Correct.
19 Q. And the other line segment would be at
20 12 o'clock?
21 A. Well, it's an approximation.
22 Q. I understand. But that's approximately
23 where the other line angle would go, to
24 12 o'clock?

Page 92

1 A. One to two o'clock.
2 Q. That would be where Justus is?
3 A. Yes.
4 Q. That's one line segment?
5 A. Okay.
6 Q. Hill is at the vertex, right, the other
7 line segment would go up to the 12 o'clock?
8 A. 12 o'clock, correct.
9 Q. You're saying that these are an
10 approximations?
11 A. Approximations.
12 Q. If the angle description that Hill gave
13 is wrong, not one o'clock or two o'clock, let's
14 say it's two minutes after 12, and you credited
15 that testimony, your opinion would not be valid at
16 least based on the testimony?
17 A. That's the data that I have.
18 Q. I know.
19 A. That's the data that I have.
20 Q. Right. But testimony can be off,
21 correct?
22 A. I don't evaluate credibility.
23 Q. Exactly. Exactly. You look at
24 physical evidence.

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
93-96

Page 93

1 A. Right.

2 Q. Isn't that the danger in a forensic

3 scientist using testimony or oral statements as

4 forensic evidence, that you have to evaluate the

5 credibility of it?

6 A. That's why we should have the Lake

7 County Task Force doing a better job.

8 Q. Okay, but you're not rendering any

9 opinions that they didn't do a good job, right?

10 That's not in your report.

11 A. If you're asking me what it is, I don't

12 think they did a good job.

13 Q. That's not in your report and I'm not

14 asking you what they did because that's going to

15 be another six hours.

16 MR. ODIM: Let him answer your questions.

17 MR. DiCIANNI: I didn't ask that question.

18 MR. ODIM: Ask different questions. It was

19 certainly related to the question that you asked.

20 BY MR. DiCIANNI:

21 Q. I don't want to get into that because

22 we don't have enough time to get into that and I

23 don't want to be here longer than I have to be,

24 either? What I am asking you -- I can't remember

Page 94

1 what I'm asking you.

2 Can you read back the last question?

3 (WHEREUPON, the record was read by

4 the reporter.)

5 BY MR. DiCIANNI:

6 Q. If your testimony regarding the

7 positioning of Justus and Officer Hill with

8 Officer Hill at the vertex and Justus between 30

9 and 60 degrees and with the other line segment

10 going to 12, if Hill was off with his evaluation

11 or his testimony of one o'clock, two o'clock, then

12 that would call your conclusion into question,

13 correct?

14 A. It would have an effect.

15 Q. Sure it would. You would have to

16 re-evaluate?

17 A. I would have to re-evaluate.

18 Q. And you still have the opinion based on

19 the autopsy angle, right? You used that also as a

20 basis for saying there was a 30-degree, 60-degree

21 orientation between Hill and Justus?

22 A. Yes, that's correct.

23 Q. So that's an alternative basis for that

24 opinion?

Page 95

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And you measured that angle by what?

3 What line segments did you use and where was the

4 vertex on establishing that angle?

5 A. It's looking at the autopsy

6 photographs. It's an estimation. There it wasn't

7 enough data -- the photograph angles of the

8 autopsy precluded me from doing another type of an

9 angle where I use a protractor.

10 Q. You couldn't use a protractor?

11 A. I couldn't use the protractor in this.

12 Q. Regarding the gunshot wound to the

13 right side of Justus's back, you relied on a

14 trajectory rod in the photograph?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And that would be Exhibit 21, correct,

17 what was that from Thomas Rudd's deposition?

18 A. I don't know the exhibit -- it's an

19 autopsy photograph.

20 Q. Did you rely on any autopsy photographs

21 other than what you referenced in your report?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. You did, all right. I was afraid you

24 were going to say that.

Page 96

1 Let's mark this as Exhibit 3.

2 (WHEREUPON, a certain document was

3 marked Scott Deposition Exhibit

4 No. 3 for identification, as of

5 04/04/2017.)

6 BY MR. DiCIANNI:

7 Q. I'm going to ask you to look through

8 the autopsy photos and ask you to point out which

9 ones you relied upon, and I never will ask a

10 witness to do something during a break because if

11 you're working we're working, okay. So we're

12 going to sit here while you do that, all right,

13 and then we'll take a break.

14 A. How do you want me to point these out?

15 Take them out? There's no numbers on them.

16 Q. There are numbers on them but our

17 paralegal has x-ray vision.

18 A. Do you want me to take them out?

19 Q. Yes. Why don't we have you take them

20 out.

21 A. Almost there.

22 Q. Sure. Take your time.

23 A. Okay.

24 MR. DiCIANNI: I'm going to suggest we take

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
97-100

Page 97

1 our break now and we'll organize these into
2 exhibits and then we'll come back. How long do
3 you want to take?
4 MS. MORAN: It's 12:15 now. We may just go
5 downstairs.
6 MR. DiCIANNI: 1:15.
7 MS. MORAN: Yes, no later than 1:15.
8 (WHEREUPON, a lunch recess was had
9 from 12:15 to 1:20 p.m.)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Page 98

1 AFTERNOON PROCEEDINGS
2 MR. DiCIANNI: Let's mark this Exhibit 4.
3 (WHEREUPON, a certain document
4 was marked Scott
5 Deposition Exhibit No. 4 for
6 identification, as of 04/04/2017.)
7 RONALD R. SCOTT,
8 called as a witness herein, having been previously
9 duly sworn and having testified, was examined and
10 testified further as follows:
11 EXAMINATION (Resumed)
12 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
13 Q. Mr. Scott, before we broke, you went
14 through all of the autopsy photographs which we
15 gave you which was the whole group of them and
16 then you picked out the ones that you used in your
17 opinions, correct?
18 A. Yes.
19 Q. And that's now what's been marked as
20 Exhibit No. 4, correct?
21 A. Yes.
22 Q. Your opinion regarding the positioning
23 of Justus and Officer Hill we've already talked
24 about it based on the testimony of Hill, but it's

Page 99

1 also based on calculations you made based on these
2 autopsy photographs, correct?
3 A. Yes.
4 Q. I'm going to ask you to tell us before
5 we go to the photographs your methods for arriving
6 at this calculation.
7 A. Well, I looked at all the photographs
8 that have to do with the wound or what I feel is
9 something that could conceivably show some data or
10 scientific information that I would be interested
11 in. Then I narrowed that down to photographs that
12 are more related to the opinions that I would give
13 and the work that I'm doing. So I picked out all
14 these photographs. These are the ones that I
15 looked at the most, but there are certain
16 photographs that have more value than others.
17 Q. In Exhibit 4?
18 A. Yes.
19 Q. Well, then, just tell us first what it
20 was you did and I'll back up for a second.
21 Based on the autopsy findings, you
22 arrived at a conclusion, I believe, that the
23 orientation positioning between Officer Hill and
24 Justus was within that 30 degrees to 60 degrees

Page 100

1 angle, correct?
2 A. Yes.
3 Q. Tell us how it is that you came to that
4 calculation based on these photographs before you
5 show us what's in the photographs. Just tell us.
6 A. I evaluated Officer Hill's statements
7 and his testimony and I evaluated the
8 demonstrative position that he demonstrated as to
9 how Mr. Howell had turned and then I look at the
10 gunshot wound evidence and I attempt to
11 synchronize the testimony to the trajectory rods
12 while looking at the video of course to see what
13 the posture of Mr. Howell is at various points in
14 the video and at points that would be consistent
15 with where the cartridge cases are found, and then
16 I keep narrowing it down testing that theory until
17 I can see those photographs that best support
18 Officer Hill's version of events or if they don't
19 support it, that as well. And that's what I did
20 in this case here.
21 I also looked at -- I did pick out some
22 photos in here that showed the bullets and one of
23 the issues with the bullets, I'm just looking at
24 the bullet for the purposes of seeing if there's

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
101-104

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 101</p> <p>1 anything in there that would indicate a gunshot 2 had struck the tree or there had been a deflexion. 3 So I'm looking at the shape and size of the bullet 4 to see did the bullet expand as it's designed to 5 do in soft tissue. 6 Q. Or whether it's pristine? 7 A. Or whether it's pristine or whether it 8 has damage. 9 Q. So am I understanding that just based 10 on the gunshot wound angles, which to the extent 11 they can be determined from the autopsy findings, 12 you are not able to come to a conclusion regarding 13 the positioning of the two people? 14 A. I can come to a position of the two 15 people, certain parts of it. 16 Q. When I asked you about the methodology, 17 you mentioned the angles the autopsy findings 18 showed. You also mentioned the positioning of the 19 casings. You also mentioned various data you got 20 from the video. 21 My question is if you were excluding 22 the casings and the video, does the gunshot wound 23 angles from the autopsy themselves provide you 24 with the data you need to render an opinion that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 103</p> <p>1 trajectory rod and we back -- reverse engineer it, 2 the trajectory rod if we followed the imaginary 3 line on that trajectory rod out to the point where 4 the shooter should be, that gives us the bullet 5 path prior to it striking the body. 6 Q. So the medical examiner's report only 7 concluded that the shots were left to right and 8 upward, correct? 9 A. And front to back. 10 Q. And front to back, correct? 11 A. Correct. 12 Q. It didn't put angles -- it didn't come 13 to any conclusions regarding angles? 14 A. I don't recall reading angles in his 15 report. 16 Q. So you concluded regarding the 30 to 17 60-degree angle based on using the trajectory rods 18 as one of the line segments in the angle, correct? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. With Officer Hill at the vertex? 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. And where would the other line segment 23 be, straight south from Officer Hill? 24 A. Straight south, yes.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 102</p> <p>1 there was a 30 to 60-degree orientation between 2 Justus and Hill? 3 A. Yes, partially, partially. 4 Q. What's partial about it? What part? 5 A. The trajectory rods do show a left to 6 right. Of course, I'm using it in conjunction 7 with the actual autopsy report and the medical 8 examiner's description of the pathway of the 9 wound. 10 Q. Okay. 11 A. So I'm looking at that and looking at 12 and then I'm looking at the trajectory rods to see 13 what he's describing in his report to see the 14 photographic evidence of exactly what he's talking 15 about because sometimes they talk upward and left 16 right, but trajectory rod is actually going to 17 show you a much better definition of what he's 18 saying in his typewritten report. 19 So I'm looking at that and when I see 20 the trajectory rods, I can see that the gunshot is 21 barely coming from the left of Mr. Howell. It's 22 going upward. Both of them are going upward, one 23 more than the other, and they're going back to 24 front. So that helps place -- if we take the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 104</p> <p>1 Q. So show me where -- let's talk about 2 the one on the right side. There's two gunshot 3 wounds, right? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. One is on the right side and one is on 6 the left side? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. Show me the photographs that you relied 9 on to arrive at these angles regarding the 10 right-sided gunshot wound. 11 A. I have autopsy 011, autopsy 012, 013, 12 021 and 022 I've looked at. They don't have 13 trajectory rods, but it does show evidence of an 14 angle, 02 -- strike that. 029, 030, 031, and I 15 believe that's it for the upper right back. 16 Q. So from the bullet holes themselves 17 without the trajectory rods, are you able to come 18 to a measurement of an angle? 19 A. A general angle. 20 Q. How do you do that? 21 A. You look at the abrasion ring, you look 22 at what is called the lead-in, the lead-in 23 abrasion ring which in this case is inferior on 24 the wound or it's at the lower part of the wound.</p>

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZIONApril 04, 2017
105-108

Page 105

1 It's like if you had a tub of butter, margarine,
2 and you took your finger and you pushed it in at
3 an angle, you'd see that the lower portion has a
4 lead-in where your finger first touches it and
5 then it goes into the margarine.
6 When a bullet is striking a person or
7 any object at an angle, it will strike as opposed
8 to a 90-degree angle, say it strikes at a
9 45-degree angle, what happens is the side of the
10 bullet that first strikes the object or the skin
11 is going to create a lead-in abrasion until the
12 rest of the bullet goes in.
13 When I see the wounds without the
14 trajectory rod, for example, on if we look at 031
15 and we see the trajectory rod, and then we look at
16 a photograph of that same gunshot wound which I
17 believe is 024 and 023, yes, 022, if you look at
18 how the trajectory rod is positioned in 031,
19 you'll see that he's got the rod going across the
20 lead in or this small defect, I'll point it out if
21 I can, it's this area here as you're looking at it
22 on this photo it looks like it's about 10:00.
23 Q. 023?
24 A. Yes.

Page 106

1 Q. There's like a little nub of some type?
2 A. Right. That's where the bullet would
3 first strike the skin because it's striking it at
4 an angle.
5 So when I'm looking at this, I'm
6 looking at it to see has the medical examiner
7 placed the trajectory rod across the lead-in; in
8 other words, I'm not trying to evaluate his
9 medical expertise, I'm looking at it from a
10 firearms perspective to see has he placed that
11 trajectory rod accurately so that the trajectory
12 rod is accurately reflecting the point at which
13 the bullet first struck the body. So that would
14 be the first thing I'm looking for.
15 Then through some of the other
16 photographs of the upper right gunshot, I'm taking
17 into account the testimony of Officer Hill and I'm
18 testing and I'm evaluating the testimony that
19 Mr. Howell is at one to two o'clock while he's in
20 the center of the clock and does that trajectory
21 rod -- is that consistent with the testimony of
22 Officer Hill, and from what I can see, it appears
23 to be consistent at least as far as the angle, not
24 the upwards angle, at least as far as the angle,

Page 107

1 the direction left to right.
2 Q. So the bullet hole itself absent the
3 trajectory rod will tell you the point of entry
4 based on the 10:00 nub that we talked about but no
5 more about the measurement of the angle, is that
6 fair to say?
7 MR. ODIM: Objection. That was not his
8 testimony.
9 BY THE WITNESS:
10 A. Well, the trajectory rod enhances it.
11 I would have to know the position of the gun, but
12 I could put them both together and come up with a
13 general -- it would be less specific than it is
14 when the trajectory rod is available.
15 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
16 Q. Well, that's my point.
17 The bullet hole itself doesn't give you
18 the measurement of the angle?
19 A. It gives you a general direction,
20 right.
21 Q. Yes. Okay. You need the trajectory
22 rod to give you the measurement of the angle,
23 right?
24 A. That gives it a more accurate data to

Page 108

1 work with.
2 Q. And how do you -- the trajectory rod is
3 put into the bullet hole in a way that it could
4 deviate from the path, the actual path of the
5 bullet, correct?
6 MR. ODIM: Objection, foundation.
7 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
8 Q. From your experience.
9 A. Well, I think that falls into the
10 medical examiner's prerogative.
11 Q. So you would defer to the medical
12 examiner regarding the reliability of the
13 trajectory rod as an indication of the angle of
14 entry?
15 A. Well, the pathway of the bullet in the
16 body, that would be the area for the medical
17 examiner to determine.
18 Q. Right. We understand that, but my
19 question is to the extent that the trajectory rods
20 are an accurate reflection of the angle of entry,
21 you would defer to the medical examiner's
22 opinion or judgment regarding how accurate that
23 would be?
24 A. That's correct.

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZIONApril 04, 2017
109-112

Page 109

1 Q. So which of the photographs that you've
2 identified regarding the right-side bullet wound
3 would be the one that was most probative or most
4 revealing to you regarding the angle?
5 A. 031, 030, 029.
6 Q. I'm sorry, you said 031. What else?
7 A. 029 and 013, 012, 011. I think that's
8 it.
9 Q. Let's just use 029. Obviously there's
10 an angle formed by the ruler or yardstick and the
11 trajectory rod, correct?
12 A. Yes.
13 Q. And is that the angle you would have
14 relied on or determined was an accurate depiction
15 of the positioning between the two people?
16 A. I looked at them all. I looked at them
17 in the aggregate. I don't think anyone gives you
18 a single ability to come up with that angle. If
19 you look at them in the totality, which is what I
20 did, evaluated them in total.
21 Q. That's what I want to understand. I
22 want to understand how these different photographs
23 with the measurements, with the trajectory rod led
24 you to the 30 to 60 percent angle, I'm sorry, 30

Page 110

1 to 60-degree angle that you concluded.
2 So 029 was one of them, right?
3 A. 029 was one.
4 Q. Did you put a protractor on here to
5 measure that angle?
6 A. No, I did not.
7 Q. What were some of the other ones? Let
8 me back up.
9 Did you use a protractor regarding any
10 of them, any of the angles?
11 A. I did not.
12 Q. How did 029 tell you that this was
13 between 30 and 60 degrees, that's just an eyeball
14 estimate?
15 A. It's an estimate, but you've got to
16 look at it in conjunction with the other
17 photographs.
18 Q. Tell me about the other ones.
19 A. For example, 031 I think is a better
20 photograph.
21 Q. Did you measure that?
22 A. I did not. Preferably we would have
23 liked to have seen an overhead photograph going
24 down which was not taken.

Page 111

1 Q. Directly overhead?
2 A. Directly overhead and even from the
3 feet up would have been more accurate. These give
4 us a general estimation, but they are aren't as
5 accurate as I would like to see them.
6 Q. From this you conclude or at least it
7 supports your opinion that there was a 30 to
8 60-degree angle created by the positions of Hill
9 and Justus?
10 A. It's consistent with what Officer Hill
11 testified that the position was of Mr. Howell in
12 relation to him as they moved south.
13 Q. What does the -- did you measure if any
14 angles or were you able to determine any angles of
15 upward trajectory?
16 A. There was insufficient data in the
17 photographs for me to do that.
18 Q. Regarding the wound on the left side,
19 tell me which photographs gave you the information
20 you needed to draw conclusions about that.
21 A. 008, 009, 010, 027, 028. That's it.
22 Q. Did the angle measurement you came to
23 regarding the right sided bullet wound tell you
24 the positioning between the two, did it tell you

Page 112

1 anything about what frame the shot would have
2 occurred in on the video?
3 A. The right side.
4 Q. The right side?
5 A. No. I was unable to determine
6 sequence.
7 Q. On the left side you were unable to
8 determine the angle so it didn't tell you anything
9 about orientation between the two from a
10 north-south -- I'm sorry, let me rephrase that.
11 From the left side bullet wound, you
12 couldn't determine the angle so it didn't tell you
13 anything about their positioning based on a
14 north-south orientation, correct?
15 A. It appears to be consistent with the
16 right side.
17 Q. In what way?
18 A. In the left to right -- general left to
19 right.
20 Q. Generally left to right?
21 A. Right, but only on the left to right
22 limitation, not the front to back or upward.
23 Q. Okay. You couldn't say it was 30 to
24 60 degrees, only that it was left to right?

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
113-116

Page 113

1 A. It was roughly generally the same as
2 the upper right.
3 Q. How did you determine that?
4 A. By looking at two photographs.
5 Q. Which ones?
6 A. I'm going to take photograph 008 to
7 start and then I'm going to take photograph 011.
8 Q. 011 and 008.
9 **A. Right.**
10 Q. Okay. So tell me what the comparison
11 of those two photographs tells you about the angle
12 of entry.
13 A. Similar, in other words, differences
14 in -- differences in the positioning of the rods
15 would be accountable to either movement of the
16 shooter, movement of the victim or a combination
17 of both.
18 Q. The comparison of these two photographs
19 doesn't tell you that the bullet entry on the
20 right side -- I'm sorry, on the left side
21 indicates a 30 to 60-degree orientation between
22 the two, correct?
23 A. Just generally consistent with each
24 other, not exact, not exact.

Page 114

1 Q. Consistent to the extent that they were
2 both left to right?
3 **A. Yes.**
4 Q. Now, you were unable to make a
5 determination based on the angles regarding the
6 right side wound as to the frame in the video in
7 which that shot would have taken place, but it
8 seems like you are making a determination
9 regarding the left side injury regarding what that
10 indicates in regards to the frame in which it was
11 shot, am I understanding that correctly?
12 MR. ODIM: Objection. Foundation and it
13 misstates his testimony and his opinions and
14 observations as expressed in the report.
15 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
16 Q. You can answer.
17 A. I think you're misunderstanding. I'm
18 talking at this point only of the left-to-right
19 angle. The upward angle is a completely different
20 category.
21 Q. What do you mean?
22 A. Okay. If we take -- if we were to take
23 Mr. Howell in the anatomical position that he's in
24 now and stand him erect, stand up straight up, the

Page 115

1 only way those gunshots can occur is if we follow
2 that trajectory rod and then follow an imaginary
3 line down and the gun would have to have been on
4 the ground facing upward.
5 So when I look at that in the video, I
6 can see Officer Hill clearly has his pistol over
7 from his shoulder, generally I call it horizontal
8 so, in other words, the arm is generally
9 horizontal, and the gun is vertical, in other
10 words, it's not canted to the left or right or
11 downward.
12 When I look at that and then I look at
13 the gunshot trajectory rods placed by medical
14 examiner, that tells me that these gunshot wounds
15 have been caused by the orientation of
16 Mr. Howell's body to the gun and not gun being
17 down on the ground shooting upwards.
18 Q. So what are you saying?
19 A. I'm saying that Mr. Howell in both of
20 these instances had his back to the gun, at least
21 the left side of his back to the gun and he was
22 bent over to some degree. In the process of
23 bending over, in the process of falling or having
24 fallen to the ground.

Page 116

1 Q. Are you saying Hill shot him after he
2 fell to the ground?
3 A. It's possible. Yes, I am.
4 Q. What do you mean it's possible?
5 A. That the trajectory rod would line up
6 because of it's acute upward -- he would either
7 have to be -- his upper body would have to be
8 parallel to the ground bent over at the waist or
9 falling or he could have been on the ground when
10 he was shot.
11 Q. But you can't say that to a reasonable
12 degree of scientific certainty that he shot him
13 when he was on the ground?
14 A. I could say that it's a possibility.
15 Q. Can you say which frame or which range
16 of frames the second shot occurred in based on
17 your measurements?
18 A. I'm not giving a sequence of shots
19 as to which one of these shots were first to
20 second.
21 Q. I'm not asking you. Okay. Good point.
22 You are not rendering any opinions
23 about the sequence of the shots?
24 **A. Correct.**

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZIONApril 04, 2017
117-120

Page 117

1 Q. You're unable to say which frame the
2 right side wound shot occurred? We've already
3 been through that.
4 A. I can include the frames that are
5 possibilities, and I can exclude the frames that
6 would not have produced it.
7 Q. For the right side?
8 A. To the right side, correct.
9 Q. Tell me what those frames would
10 be.
11 A. I have to just look at those still
12 photos again.
13 Q. Okay.
14 A. I'm talking about the video frames.
15 Q. We could do it either on the hard
16 copies or on the video itself.
17 A. Exhibit 2.
18 Q. Exhibit 2, yes, that's the series of
19 frames.
20 A. The gunshot which could be excluded
21 would be from 259 backwards going back to 231.
22 Q. So are you only talking about the right
23 side or either side?
24 A. At this point I'm only talking about

Page 118

1 the right side.
2 Q. In your opinion, the right side could
3 not have occurred from 231 to 259?
4 MR. ODIM: Ron, would this be clearer on the
5 screen?
6 MR. DiCIANNI: We could do it that way if you
7 want.
8 BY THE WITNESS:
9 A. Move up to 257 or you could move up to
10 259. Now, at 258 it's possible for the gunshot in
11 the right shoulder to have occurred. The problem
12 is there's a discharged cartridge case that is
13 some 12 feet forward of the gun so that's
14 inconsistent of it happening at this point.
15 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
16 Q. Let's just focus, though, on what the
17 angles tell us, okay.
18 The right side bullet wound could have
19 occurred at 258 based on the angles?
20 A. Yes.
21 Q. What about the left side?
22 A. The left side you would have to move up
23 to -- beginning at 275, only the angle, but this
24 is not consistent with the cartridge case location

Page 119

1 so it is in disagreement.
2 Q. We'll deal with that as, well, but
3 okay.
4 Just the angles now, what is the
5 angles -- what does the angle tell you about when
6 these the left-sided shot could have occurred?
7 A. Well, it shows Justus Howell went over
8 at the waist. It shows Officer Hill with his
9 firearm and arms extended horizontally and the gun
10 vertical, in the vertical plane, and when I look
11 at Justus Howell in this position, a gunshot that
12 struck him on the left side could produce the
13 upward angle into his body because he's bent over
14 at the waist and that would extrapolate back to
15 the muzzle of the gun.
16 Q. The way in which he's pointing the gun
17 in all of the frames would rule out that he shot
18 Justus while he was on the ground; isn't that
19 correct?
20 A. That's not correct.
21 Q. Show me a frame in which you think it
22 would be possible that he shot him while he was on
23 the ground?
24 A. We would have to move up to where

Page 120

1 Mr. Howell was on the ground, however, we cannot
2 see Officer Hill behind the tree.
3 Q. I see. So what frame are you referring
4 to? You've got the book in front of you.
5 A. At 282, from 282 if we move up to --
6 this only goes up to 285, but if we move up to
7 the 287 area and now we see Officer Hill
8 beginning to move towards the tree and
9 unfortunately at this point here you'll become
10 obstructed, but at that point you can still see
11 him now he's obstructed.
12 Q. At 292 he's obstructed?
13 A. He's obstructed and Howell was on the
14 ground.
15 Q. Keep going. Let's keep going.
16 He comes out from behind the tree --
17 well, it was before what we're looking at now.
18 What's the first frame where he comes
19 out from behind the tree? Is it 309?
20 A. I think it's about 304.
21 Q. In each of the frames before he goes
22 behind the tree and each of the frames after he
23 comes out from behind the tree, his gun is pointed
24 in a direction which would be inconsistent with

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZIONApril 04, 2017
121-124

Page 121

1 Justus being shot on the ground, correct?

2 A. I don't know what effect the recoil has

3 on Officer Hill at that point.

4 Q. What do you mean?

5 A. When you shoot a gun, there is recoil,

6 both linear recoil and vertical recoil.

7 Q. What are you suggesting here?

8 A. I can't tell if Officer Hill has fired

9 from behind the tree. What I'm saying is looking

10 only at Mr. Howell, if he was on the ground that

11 could produce that upward angle. If Officer

12 Howell (sic) has fired from behind the tree and

13 the cartridge case indicates that he did fire from

14 behind the tree.

15 Q. The firing from behind the -- well, the

16 direction that we can see the gun pointed in in

17 every instance is inconsistent with Justus being

18 shot while he was on the ground unless there was a

19 recoil that would have redirected the direction of

20 the gun, correct?

21 A. Except from when he was behind the

22 tree, correct.

23 Q. We can't see what happens behind the

24 tree?

Page 122

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. Did you look at the computer animation

3 I'll call it that was put together by the expert

4 that the Task Force retained to do that?

5 A. I don't recall seeing anything in that

6 line, no.

7 Q. Obviously you have no opinion on that

8 opinion?

9 A. I don't even know what you're talking

10 about.

11 Q. That's a good way to cut off an entire

12 line of questioning.

13 It looks like you read Thomas Rudd's

14 deposition and relied on it for at least

15 something.

16 What did you rely on Rudd's deposition

17 for?

18 A. I wanted to see if there was any

19 changes in his testimony. I believe it that's

20 Dr. Rudd.

21 Q. Dr. Rudd.

22 A. I wanted to see if there was anything

23 in there that conflicted with his autopsy report.

24 Q. Was it your understanding that Dr. Rudd

Page 123

1 did the autopsy?

2 A. I don't have a good recollection of

3 what doctor did the autopsy.

4 Q. So you only read Dr. Rudd's deposition

5 for purposes of seeing if he had some observation

6 from the autopsy that would have been inconsistent

7 with your opinions; is that fair to say?

8 A. Well, inconsistent with the photographs

9 of the autopsy, with the trajectory rods and the

10 autopsy report itself.

11 Q. Did you find anything in his deposition

12 that was inconsistent with any of those sources?

13 A. Nothing significant that would affect

14 my opinions.

15 Q. Is it appropriate it from a forensic

16 perspective to rely on the deposition testimony of

17 Dr. Rudd?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Would it affect your opinion if

20 you understood that he was not a medical

21 examiner?

22 A. I would certainly want to reconcile if

23 any significant conflicts and obviously have to

24 refer that to counsel to look at from a different

Page 124

1 perspective.

2 Q. Would it affect your opinion at all if

3 you knew that he was under indictment for perjury?

4 MR. ODIM: Objection. Irrelevant.

5 BY THE WITNESS:

6 A. I can only take the information that I

7 have. That's what I had at the time I was doing

8 my evaluation.

9 BY MR. DiCIANNI:

10 Q. Would it affect your opinion if you

11 knew he didn't do the autopsy?

12 A. That's an issue of credibility.

13 Q. The location of the casings seems to be

14 crucial to your opinions; is that fair to say?

15 A. It's an important factor, yes.

16 Q. You conclude from the location of the

17 casings that Officer Hill shot at a later point

18 than when he says he does on or around 257 as you

19 read it?

20 A. That's correct.

21 Q. And it's your opinion that Officer Hill

22 would have completed both shots in a quarter of a

23 second from 257 based on his testimony; is that

24 what you're concluding?

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
125-128

Page 125

1 A. At or about 257.
2 Q. You disagree based on the ejection
3 patterns that you would expect from that gun to
4 the right and to the rear, correct?
5 A. Correct.
6 Q. Are you aware of any cautions in the
7 forensic world about putting too much reliance on
8 the location of shell casings?
9 A. Yes, I am.
10 Q. What are those based on?
11 A. Grip, orientation of the pistol.
12 That's why I always spoke for both horizontal and
13 vertical orientation that I see the officer in
14 with his pistol, height of the pistol above the
15 ground, the canting upward or downward, the
16 direction of the pistol when shooting, tightness
17 of the grip to a novice as opposed to an
18 experienced person, and then there's the issue of
19 the ground surface and there's two aspects to
20 that. There's the point of impact and then
21 there's the final resting location.
22 The additional aspect that has to come
23 into play is the possibility of dislocation
24 through the arrival of medical personnel or people

Page 126

1 that should not be in the crime scene area. That
2 has to be taken into account.
3 Q. All those factors have to be taken into
4 consideration if you're going to rely on the
5 casings?
6 A. Correct.
7 Q. Even though they're designed to go
8 right and rear, they don't always go right and
9 rear, correct?
10 A. Generally they do.
11 Q. Are you familiar with studies about
12 casing ejection and the rate at which they go
13 right and rear when they're designed to go right
14 and rear?
15 A. It depends upon the pistol model and
16 the physical design.
17 Q. Did you do any studies regarding
18 Officer Hill's -- well, did you review any
19 ejection studies regarding the rates and ejection
20 pattern regarding Officer Hill's weapon?
21 A. Unfortunately the Lake County task
22 force once again failed to do a basic forensic
23 test contiguous with this shooting incident.
24 Ideally they should have done it -- for me

Page 127

1 20 months later after the pistol has been
2 returned to him, that would not be the ideal
3 situation. The next best alternative is to use
4 the studies and treatises available for that
5 design of gun.
6 Q. So did you refer to some studies and
7 treatises available for that type of gun?
8 A. Yes, I did.
9 Q. For that particular make and model?
10 A. Yes.
11 Q. Tell me what those studies were.
12 A. I believe I provided them to
13 Mr. Rubinstein. They should have been disclosed.
14 Q. You did?
15 A. Yes.
16 Q. Are they in your report, then?
17 A. They're not in the report.
18 Q. Why are they not in the report?
19 A. They're supporting materials.
20 Q. Doesn't Rule 26 require you to disclose
21 what you based your opinion on?
22 A. They should have been disclosed.
23 Q. Would you agree your report is
24 defective based on it not containing a very

Page 128

1 important fact or a very important source
2 regarding your opinion?
3 A. No. I believe this --
4 MR. ODIM: Objection. This is the
5 attorney -- an attorney's issue. He's not an
6 expert on the court rules, and if we do have
7 those, then we will certainly tender them as soon
8 as --
9 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
10 Q. You didn't sign your report?
11 A. I did.
12 Q. I don't see a signature on it.
13 A. I did sign it.
14 Q. Take a look at Exhibit 1 and show me
15 where your signature should be found. Maybe I
16 missed it somehow.
17 A. There is no signature on Exhibit 1.
18 Q. You've been an expert witness for a
19 long time.
20 You've familiar with Rule 26?
21 A. Yes.
22 Q. You know that it's required to be
23 signed by the expert?
24 A. I signed my report and forwarded it to

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
129-132

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 129</p> <p>1 Mr. Rubenstein. 2 MR. ODIM: And we will get you that version. 3 BY MR. DiCIANNI: 4 Q. Do you know if that version is any 5 different from the version that's been presented 6 to us unsigned? 7 A. It better not be. It certainly 8 shouldn't. 9 Q. You put the report -- you put these 10 studies in the report you completed? 11 A. Well, I made reference to the studies 12 in my report and then I submitted the studies as 13 supporting materials. I'll see if I can find that 14 for you. Page 12, Section D and it's the 15 paragraph under the two smaller paragraphs 16 beginning with: "This pistol was not tested..." 17 Q. You talk about treatise sources had no 18 mechanical design of the weapon. 19 You don't identify the actual treatise 20 sources or known -- or define information, 21 correct? 22 A. Correct, although I did mention that in 23 my qualification section with regards to the SIG 24 Sauer pistols.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 131</p> <p>1 Your opinion assumes that the grip 2 utilized in this case did not affect the location 3 of the casings, correct? 4 A. I'm looking at Mr. Hill's training 5 record. It indicated he would be a highly 6 qualified marksman and well above average 7 police-trained shooter. 8 Q. That tells you that his grip would be 9 conventional? 10 A. It would be conventional and he would 11 be better trained than the average trained police 12 officer which most of the studies are based on? 13 Q. That would suggest to you that his grip 14 would not have altered the right rear pattern, 15 ejection pattern? 16 A. That's a fair statement. 17 Q. That was your conclusion? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. It's an assumption based on your 20 knowledge of Officer Hill's qualifications? 21 A. Correct. 22 Q. It could also have been affected by the 23 wind? 24 A. The wind?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 130</p> <p>1 Q. Tell me these studies that you relied 2 on regarding this particular pistol. 3 A. There were two videos which I provided 4 and then there were a number of articles from I 5 believe it might have been Mr. Haag's book or 6 Mr. Hueske's or both. There was an article that 7 I provided from the Indiana Engineering Journal by 8 a gentleman by the name of John Nixon. There may 9 have been another study. I just don't recall what 10 it is right now. 11 Q. What do these studies say about the 12 I'll call it the error rate regarding the ejection 13 of casings from this type of a pistol to the right 14 to the rear? What do they say about that? 15 A. I don't recall the error rates. 16 Q. We talked about the different factors 17 that can affect where casings end up, correct? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. We talked about the way the officer is 20 holding the gun, what did you call that? 21 A. Grip. 22 Q. Grip. How did you determine that the 23 grip couldn't have affected where the -- strike 24 that.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 132</p> <p>1 Q. Yes. 2 A. Insignificant. 3 Q. Why do you say that? 4 A. Cartridge case is not going to be 5 affected by the wind unless it is after the point 6 of impact. 7 Q. Why would that matter? 8 A. Because the cartridge case is not going 9 to be involved -- is not going to have a 10 significant -- it's going to be ejected through 11 momentum of the mechanical action of the gun and 12 it's going to fall to its point of impact through 13 gravity. Wind is not going to have a significant 14 effect on a cartridge case in such a short 15 distance. 16 Q. Well, are there studies that you base 17 that opinion on, that winds will not have an 18 effect? 19 A. I'm not aware of any studies. 20 Q. So where do you derive that opinion 21 that the wind can't affect location? 22 A. Experience and training with the SIG 23 Sauer line of pistols. 24 Q. You fired SIG Sauer pistols outdoors in</p>

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
133-136

Page 133

1 the wind?

2 **A. Yes.**

3 **Q. When?**

4 A. Carried SIG Sauer pistols as a police
5 officer and this is in my report, in 1987 and 1988
6 I was involved in the State Police evaluation of
7 transitioning from revolvers to semiautomatic
8 pistols. SIG Sauer was one of the pistols we
9 evaluated.

10 After the SIG Sauer was chosen for the
11 department firearm, I carried that for
12 approximately at least ten years, fired it every
13 year, yearly qualification, and just by virtue of
14 my work in the forensic laboratory, I've had
15 literally hundreds of occasions to fire the SIG
16 Sauer pistol. I own a SIG Sauer pistol. I
17 actually purchased the one that I carried when I
18 was with the police and I still own it today and
19 I'm very familiar with them, been involved in
20 competitions with them.

21 Q. None of the studies discussed wind
22 effect?

23 A. The wind is not an effect. I have not
24 seen any effect of winds on the cartridge case

Page 134

1 ejection patterns except after point of impact.

2 Q. So studies, I'm asking about studies.

3 You haven't seen any studies that can have some
4 impact on --

5 A. I have not seen any studies.

6 Q. When you qualified as a police officer
7 with the SIG Sauer, that was indoors, right?

8 A. That was outdoors and indoors.

9 Q. Did you ever have a shooting incident
10 as a police officer?

11 A. Thankfully no.

12 Q. You never had to shoot anybody?

13 A. In the service.

14 Q. I'm talking about as a police officer.

15 **A. No.**

16 Q. Never was involved in a shoot-don't
17 shoot scenario as a police officer?

18 A. A real situation or --

19 Q. A real situation, not training, real
20 situation.

21 A. Well, I've been involved where I've had
22 my firearm out, but I didn't have to shoot.

23 Q. You didn't to make a decision on
24 whether to shoot?

Page 135

1 A. Well, I made the decision not to
2 shoot.

3 Q. Are you familiar with any studies that
4 have -- well, did you take into consideration any
5 effect that Officer Hill's movement might have on
6 the location of the casings?

7 **A. Yes.**

8 Q. What did you do to take that into
9 consideration?

10 A. Movement would have a slight impact on
11 its point of impact. What it would not have is
12 any variation in its forward movement to the
13 extent I see in this particular shooting.

14 Q. Define for me point of impact.

15 A. Point of impact is where the cartridge
16 case has been ejected, the first time it strikes
17 the ground.

18 Q. Strikes anything?

19 A. Strikes anything.

20 Q. You're saying that that would
21 only affect -- movement would not affect how
22 casings could be ejected or the direction in which
23 they could be ejected except after it hit
24 something, that's what you're saying?

Page 136

1 A. No, that's not what I'm saying. It
2 would be minimal alteration in the ejection
3 pattern because we're talking about the timing of
4 the ejection, we're talking about 1/16th to 1/8th
5 of a second, so whatever that movement is, that's
6 within that 1/8th to 1/16th of a second would
7 change that point of impact, and there is a
8 general area of impact which could be six to eight
9 feet.

10 Q. Hill is running at the time he's
11 shooting, right?

12 A. Not necessarily.

13 Q. Let's look at it.

14 You disagree that's running? Doesn't
15 that video show clearly that he's running?

16 A. He's moving fast.

17 Q. So you distinguish that from running?

18 MR. ODIM: Is that a question?

19 BY THE WITNESS:

20 A. It looks walking fast to me.

21 BY MR. DiCIANNI:

22 Q. Okay. Well, we can differ on that
23 opinion. I'm no physicist, but Newton's laws of
24 motion tells us that everything that's moving in a

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
137-140

Page 137

1 direction that is going to continue moving in that
2 direction until something stops it, correct?
3 A. That's correct.
4 Q. So why doesn't that affect the ejection
5 pattern in this case that he's moving quickly, you
6 say walking fast, I say running, but he's moving
7 it quickly why wouldn't that affect it?
8 A. It would within that 1/8th to 1/16th of
9 a second.
10 Q. But where do you come up with those
11 numbers?
12 A. That's the amount of time it takes the
13 cartridge case to get ejected from the gun.
14 Q. 1/8th to what?
15 A. I think it's 1/16th to 1/8th of a
16 second. I'll have to look at my report. I want
17 to be accurate on that.
18 Q. So it's going to move forward with the
19 gun for 1/8th -- 1/16th to 1/8th of a second?
20 A. That would be the area that it would
21 be, whatever movement that gun has completed in
22 that 1/8th to 1/16th, that would be the movement
23 forward.
24 Q. How do you know that the momentum --

Page 138

1 using general physics principles, how do you know
2 that the momentum isn't going to affect its
3 movement forward movement?
4 A. Because the mechanical action of the
5 gun is under it spring tension. That's what's
6 pulling it out and it's operating under recoil.
7 Q. Is there hang time on this?
8 A. What's that?
9 Q. Is there hang time on these ejected
10 casings?
11 A. No. It's instant.
12 Q. Are you aware of any studies that have
13 been done regarding the effect of casing ejection
14 based on a running police officer?
15 A. I can't say there aren't any. I think
16 I may have read some, but I don't recall them
17 now.
18 Q. So you wouldn't have applied any of
19 those in your opinions in this case if you can't
20 remember them?
21 A. No. I didn't apply them in this case
22 because they wouldn't apply.
23 Q. So your opinion assumes that the
24 movement of Officer Hill in a forward direction

Page 139

1 didn't affect the location of the casings?
2 A. There was a minor alteration as opposed
3 to being standing still, but it's that 1/8th of a
4 second so it might change it by a foot, a foot or
5 two.
6 Q. How do you quantify that?
7 A. Because he is moving, the gun is moving
8 and then we have the point of impact so it would
9 be whatever he's moving within that 1/8th of a
10 second and I can't tell how fast he's moving in
11 that video.
12 Q. But the one foot impact you're just
13 speculating about that?
14 A. No. That would be the variance --
15 because the ejected cartridge case doesn't come
16 out exactly at the same angle of the shot. It
17 comes out generally to the right and rear.
18 There's going to be a slight variation.
19 Q. Right. Even under the most controlled
20 situations there could be variations?
21 A. But the variation would not include
22 going forward under any circumstances, not
23 according to the.
24 Q. You have studies to prove that?

Page 140

1 A. Yes, I've submitted them.
2 Q. If I told you that there are studies
3 that show that 24 percent of the time the gun like
4 this will not eject right and to the rear but will
5 eject sometimes forward, sometimes to the left,
6 sometimes elsewhere, would you disagree with
7 that?
8 MR. ODIM: Objection. Foundation.
9 BY THE WITNESS:
10 A. Please show them to me. I'd like to
11 share them with my colleagues.
12 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
13 Q. All right. So the answer then is no,
14 you don't agree with that if you don't believe
15 there are such things, there are such reports?
16 A. Not in the conventional horizontal and
17 vertical plane that I see Officer Hill in.
18 Q. Which you're assuming that that's based
19 on his experience and his qualifications and
20 capabilities, you're assuming he was in that
21 perfectly conventional grip?
22 A. That's what the video shows.
23 Q. You can't see his grip in the video.
24 A. I can see what I see in the video.

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
141-144

Page 141

1 Q. Is that because you have that
2 enhanced -- that special monitor at home that
3 tells you -- you can even see his grip?
4 A. I can see his arms parallel to the
5 ground. I can see him in a traditional police
6 shooting position. I have no -- there is no
7 evidence that that gun is tilted or canted to the
8 left or to the right that it would effect the
9 normal ejection pattern.
10 Q. How do you know what's not canted to
11 the left or to the right?
12 A. I can see his hands in the video.
13 Q. You can see whether his hands are
14 straight up or certain degrees to the right or
15 left?
16 A. I see him walking in a very static
17 weaver stance type motion it forward moving fast.
18 Q. And that allows you to assume the grip
19 that he's using?
20 A. Yes. It's not an assumption. I can
21 see it, and that's how police are trained.
22 Q. So that's what you're basing it on, not
23 the super monitor that you have?
24 A. And that as well. That as well.

Page 142

1 Q. What about the cartridges bounced off
2 Hill, you're assuming that they didn't bounce off
3 Hill as he's moving forward?
4 A. I don't see any evidence that they
5 would have bounced off Hill.
6 Q. Right. So you're assuming that they
7 didn't?
8 A. The ejection pattern with his arms
9 fully extended the ejection pattern in my opinion
10 the cartridges would not be bouncing off him.
11 Q. Why not?
12 A. He has his arms fully extended. I know
13 I've looked at his height and I took into account
14 the fact his arms were approximately 34 inches
15 long so that his pistol would be out further than
16 his hands. So we've got about a three foot
17 distance from his body and with the ejection
18 taking place in about 1/8th of a second, even with
19 him moving forward the cartridge case and the gun
20 is designed to prevent cartridge casings from
21 coming back striking the shooter.
22 Q. So your opinions regarding the location
23 of the casings and what that tells you about when
24 the shots were fired assumes that he held the gun

Page 143

1 in a particular way that it wasn't canted, that
2 wind had no effect on it, that it didn't bounce
3 off Hill, that his running wouldn't have affected
4 it in any significant way, and that some other
5 outside source didn't affect where it ended up,
6 correct?
7 MR. ODIM: Objection. That's an incomplete
8 rendition of what his testimony was.
9 BY THE WITNESS:
10 A. I didn't address the issue of outside
11 source.
12 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
13 Q. Okay. Well, you would have had to
14 assume that no outside source did anything to
15 affect its location in order to use those
16 locations as a basis for an opinion, correct?
17 A. At least as far as the cartridge case
18 next to the tree, that's correct.
19 Q. What makes you so certain that
20 somebody, an EMT or somebody at the scene couldn't
21 have affected it?
22 A. It's possible that the cartridge case
23 on the sidewalk could have been disclosed by
24 location of an officer or one of the cruisers that

Page 144

1 actually pulled up onto the sidewalk.
2 As far as the cartridge case next to
3 the tree, even if a person had dislocated with his
4 foot, this was in a grassy area with some roots
5 with a tree. It would not have been dislocated
6 more than a foot or two from where it had -- its
7 final resting place.
8 Q. So where would you expect the casings
9 to end up had Hill fired as you say within .25 of
10 a second from 257 or thereabouts? Where would you
11 think they would end up?
12 A. In the driveway.
13 Q. On the surface of the driveway?
14 A. Point of impact on the surface of the
15 driveway somewhere approximately mid center about
16 six to eight feet of his right or right rear,
17 mostly to the right rear. And then from the point
18 of impact, it's possible it could have rolled.
19 Q. How confident are you with the .25
20 second firing calculation that you've used?
21 A. I am very confident with that.
22 Q. What do you base that on?
23 A. Officer Hill -- first of all, there are
24 studies that show the average trained police

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZIONApril 04, 2017
145-148

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 145</p> <p>1 officer can fire four to five shots per second, 2 which averages out to quarter of a second or less. 3 Officer Hill in my opinion is a very highly 4 qualified officer. It's my opinion that he could 5 easily match that standard. Based upon the 6 training record that I've read, SWAT team and his 7 frequency of training, I believe he would be able 8 to exceed the quarter of a second. 9 Q. Per shot? 10 A. For two shots he could most likely do 11 it less than a quarter of a second. 12 Q. Less than a quarter of a second? 13 A. Less than a quarter of a second. 14 Q. Do you know what Fitt's law is? 15 A. I don't. 16 Q. So you did not apply Fitt's law at all 17 in this case; obviously you didn't? 18 A. I didn't. 19 MR. DiCIANNI: Let's take a break. 20 (WHEREUPON, a recess was had.) 21 MR. DiCIANNI: What was the last question? 22 (WHEREUPON, the record was read by 23 the reporter.) 24 BY MR. DiCIANNI:</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 147</p> <p>1 the weight of the full bullet and casing, not the 2 casing? 3 A. And the amount of propellant, but the 4 propellant wouldn't really have much in the way of 5 weight. 6 MR. DiCIANNI: Let's mark this as the next 7 exhibit as Exhibit 5. 8 (WHEREUPON, a certain document was 9 marked Scott Deposition Exhibit 10 No. 5 for identification, as of 11 04/04/2017.) 12 BY MR. DiCIANNI: 13 Q. Take a look at Exhibit No. 5. Can you 14 identify that document? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. What is it? 17 A. This is a shooting scene measurements 18 form that I made up prior to going out to the 19 scene. 20 Q. You made it prior to going out to the 21 scene, are you talking about columns one and two? 22 A. Everything except for the measurement. 23 Q. Everything except for column three, the 24 measurement column?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 146</p> <p>1 Q. Did you consider the type of bullet 2 that was in Hill's gun in your determination about 3 the effect it might have on the location of the 4 casing? 5 A. I took it into account. 6 Q. What type of bullet was it? 7 A. I can't remember right now what it was. 8 It was a 45 automatic jacketed hollow point, but I 9 forget the manufacturer. 10 Q. What did the type of bullet tell you on 11 the effect it could have on the ejected casing? 12 A. It wouldn't be the type of bullet 13 itself. It would be the pressure that's 14 generated. 15 Q. Well, wouldn't the weight of the casing 16 differ based on the type of bullet? 17 A. No. 18 Q. Not at all? 19 A. The casing is set by industry standard. 20 The bullet can change in weight but diameter will 21 not change. 22 Q. What about the casing? 23 A. The casing is standard. 24 Q. So it's only the bullet that affects</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 148</p> <p>1 A. Right. 2 Q. You went out to the scene and you made 3 these measurements which are somewhat self 4 explanatory, right? 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. And from the frames, you were able to 7 determine a precise location of, for example, 8 Officer Hill at 257, 262, correct? 9 A. Yes, yes. 10 Q. And did you have any assistance with 11 this? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. Who helped you? 14 A. Michael Clancy. 15 Q. Who is Michael Clancy? 16 A. Michael Clancy, I think he's a retired 17 Chicago police officer. My understanding is he 18 does some investigative work for the law firm of 19 SDR. 20 Q. You mean was the Duffy, now it's -- now 21 it's Stetler & Rotert. So they put you in touch 22 with this Michael Clancy and he helped you with 23 the measurements? 24 A. He drove me out and basically I just</p>

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZIONApril 04, 2017
149-152

Page 149

1 told him step on the tape measure over there I
2 want to take a measurement, but I took the actual
3 measurements.
4 Q. Which of your opinions did these
5 measurements have some impact on?
6 A. Once again, please.
7 Q. Which of your opinions did these
8 measurements have some effect on?
9 A. I believe all of them.
10 Q. In what way?
11 A. Do you want me to go down each one.
12 Q. Sure?
13 A. The discharged cartridge case on the
14 sidewalk, I measured it approximately 26 feet from
15 where Officer Hill was located, approximately
16 where he was located in the video. And so I was
17 looking at the 26 feet and that seemed a little
18 unusual from the point of impact, but then I
19 allowed for the arrival of the cruiser which drove
20 up on the -- it actually drove up through the
21 driveway where I would expect the cartridge case
22 to have been and then the officer got out of the
23 vehicle so there might have been some movement and
24 that was the cartridge case that was found

Page 150

1 underneath the cruiser after he had backed off.
2 Q. So let me stop you for a second.
3 Is Officer Hill in the same place at
4 257 and 262?
5 A. I think he's moved a couple of feet.
6 Q. Slightly?
7 A. Yes, forward, south he's moved south.
8 Q. Go ahead. Next one.
9 A. Then I made the same frames to the
10 cartridge case next to the tree and that came to
11 19 to 21 feet and this is where we eliminate the
12 ejection pattern going that far forward if Officer
13 Hill is in the driveway where he stated he made
14 the decision to shoot.
15 Q. What accounts for this range from 19 to
16 21?
17 A. Officer Hill testified that it was at
18 257 where he demonstrated Justus Howell turned
19 towards him with the gun and it was at that point
20 he had made the decision to shoot and so I
21 allowed -- from 257 to 262 I made an allowance for
22 the reaction time. From the time the brain said
23 pull the trigger to the time he actually is
24 capable of mechanically pulling the trigger takes

Page 151

1 about .31 or 1/3 of a second so I took 1/3 of the
2 15 frames and I added the -- those five frames to
3 come up to 262 as the possible location where he
4 may have fired a shot at least according to his
5 testimony. Then I look at that in relation to
6 could the cartridge case have gone 21 feet
7 forward, that's what that measurement was for.
8 Q. Do you quarrel with Officer Hill's
9 testimony that he made the decision to shoot at or
10 around 257?
11 A. Have a quarrel with it?
12 Q. Do you disagree with that?
13 A. That's his testimony.
14 Q. Does your study dispute that?
15 A. I don't believe he did.
16 Q. You don't believe he did?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. Where do you believe he made the
19 decision to shoot?
20 A. Maybe I misunderstood the question.
21 The trajectory rods, in other words, the position
22 of Justus Howell at that point in time when I look
23 at 257 and I allow the one third of a second, when
24 I look at Justus Howell's posture, if he had fired

Page 152

1 at that point in time, those trajectory rods could
2 not -- the gunshot wounds as shown in the autopsy
3 would not -- the results would not have occurred
4 as they are shown.
5 Q. Yes. I understand that. And you think
6 he shot later?
7 A. Yes.
8 Q. We've been through that. We won't go
9 through it again.
10 A. Okay.
11 Q. So to you it's irrelevant as to when
12 the decision to shoot would have been, that
13 doesn't play a role in your analysis at all; your
14 focus is on when he shot?
15 A. I want to look at everything because I
16 want to be as accurate as I can.
17 Q. I'll come back to my question, then.
18 Do you dispute in any way or does your
19 study in any way dispute that Officer Hill decided
20 to shoot at 257?
21 A. No, not as far as his decision.
22 Q. And then 262, you get that number or
23 that frame based on the one third of a second that
24 it would take him to shoot?

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZIONApril 04, 2017
153-156

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 153</p> <p>1 A. Yes, if he had actually pulled the</p> <p>2 trigger.</p> <p>3 Q. What was the next one that you had?</p> <p>4 A. The next one would be -- I'm actually</p> <p>5 looking at both of these, Officer Hill at frame</p> <p>6 257 and Officer Hill at frame 262 so I'm taking</p> <p>7 them separately but I'm looking at the distance of</p> <p>8 Mr. Howell from him at that point. I just wanted</p> <p>9 to get a reference. I didn't know whether it</p> <p>10 would be important or not but I want to get a</p> <p>11 reference while I'm at the scene.</p> <p>12 The next one is the center of the</p> <p>13 concrete pathway in front of the residence,</p> <p>14 directly -- directly each of the cartridge case</p> <p>15 placard number two next to the tree, that's ten</p> <p>16 feet. What I'm unable to determine in the video</p> <p>17 is the exact location Officer Hill is in relation</p> <p>18 to that cartridge case next to the tree so I've</p> <p>19 taken the neutral position of the center of the</p> <p>20 pathway and used that as a determination to see</p> <p>21 what effect that would have on the point of impact</p> <p>22 of the cartridge case and when I look at it eight</p> <p>23 to ten feet, what I actually was looking at here</p> <p>24 was is there a possibility that the cartridge case</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 155</p> <p>1 cartridge case and it shows the tree.</p> <p>2 Q. The crime scene photo?</p> <p>3 A. Yes, correct.</p> <p>4 Q. I'm going to hand you and this ask you</p> <p>5 to -- oh, you have it. Okay. Point out the</p> <p>6 photograph that you're referring to.</p> <p>7 A. I came to it right away. I don't know</p> <p>8 what photograph it is.</p> <p>9 Q. We'll identify it.</p> <p>10 MS. AZARI: It's 837 I believe.</p> <p>11 BY THE WITNESS:</p> <p>12 A. Actually the next photo is just as</p> <p>13 good.</p> <p>14 BY MR. DiCIANNI:</p> <p>15 Q. Is that it?</p> <p>16 A. Yes, it is, and the next photo is shows</p> <p>17 the placard a little bit better.</p> <p>18 MR. DiCIANNI: I'm going to mark these two as</p> <p>19 the next two exhibits and then we're going to put</p> <p>20 them up on the screen.</p> <p>21 (WHEREUPON, certain documents were</p> <p>22 marked Scott Deposition Exhibit</p> <p>23 Nos. 6 & 7 for identification, as</p> <p>24 of 04/04/2017.)</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 154</p> <p>1 could have struck the tree and bounced back and</p> <p>2 it's possible but it doesn't seem probable given</p> <p>3 the ten feet, the cartridge case would point of</p> <p>4 impact be more closely to the six to eight foot</p> <p>5 distance from officer Howell. I then -- I'm</p> <p>6 sorry, that's the 12-foot, that's the next one,</p> <p>7 the 12-foot. The cartridge case was actually at</p> <p>8 ten feet.</p> <p>9 I then looked at -- there's a tree limb</p> <p>10 that's directly above the cartridge case. I</p> <p>11 wanted to see whether or not if Officer Hill was</p> <p>12 directly next to the tree, could the cartridge</p> <p>13 case have ejected upward far enough to obstruct</p> <p>14 the tree that was growing on an angle. I wasn't</p> <p>15 able to make a determination at that but it did</p> <p>16 show that it's possible.</p> <p>17 Q. You know, I'm going to stop you there</p> <p>18 because I'm not following you on that. I think we</p> <p>19 should pull up the scene and you could explain to</p> <p>20 me what you mean by that.</p> <p>21 What did you mean?</p> <p>22 A. Actually I was looking at still</p> <p>23 photographs. There's actually several photographs</p> <p>24 that show the exact location of this discharged</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 156</p> <p>1 BY MR. DiCIANNI:</p> <p>2 Q. We were talking about distance from the</p> <p>3 ground, distance to tree limb, is that where we</p> <p>4 were?</p> <p>5 A. Yes. The tree limb is on the left side</p> <p>6 of this first photo so I measured at a point that</p> <p>7 went directly up above the placard number two,</p> <p>8 straight up, you can see it comes to a little bit</p> <p>9 of a bend, it begins to arc upwards and I in</p> <p>10 measured in that again area, five to six feet just</p> <p>11 up above the cartridge case.</p> <p>12 Q. The bottom of that limb, how is it five</p> <p>13 to six feet?</p> <p>14 A. Five to six feet because I'm accounting</p> <p>15 for a little bit of the curvature as it goes</p> <p>16 upwards.</p> <p>17 Q. Did that play any role in any of your</p> <p>18 conclusions?</p> <p>19 A. It's my belief that the discharged</p> <p>20 cartridge case would not have struck that tree</p> <p>21 limb.</p> <p>22 Q. Based on what?</p> <p>23 A. The height of the gun above the ground</p> <p>24 and I looked at Officer Hill's height, for a</p>

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZIONApril 04, 2017
157-160

Page 157

1 person of his height, the gun would have been
2 approximately 49 inches, 47 to 50 inches above the
3 ground if he was holding it level and so for the
4 cartridge case to come out of the pistol where he
5 would have been located over on the pathway, that
6 limb would not have been an obstruction that it
7 would have struck on its ejection path.
8 Q. Wouldn't be a determination that you
9 would make by measuring east to west?
10 A. No because I'm placing -- I don't know
11 the specific position and I'm placing Officer Hill
12 in as neutral a position as I can which is the
13 center of the concrete pathway and that's also
14 based upon his own testimony that when he was
15 moving south in Spaeth's he continued south across
16 the driveway and the concrete pathway in front of
17 that house is in line with the concrete pathway in
18 front of Spaeth's.
19 Q. Go ahead.
20 A. I did this before I went there. I
21 didn't know what value it might have but I did
22 want to find out what was the space that Officer
23 Hill might have had in between the parked motor
24 vehicle that we see in the vehicle that are in

Page 158

1 front of Spaeth's Woodworking, I measured it,
2 that's not data that is important to me in this
3 case.
4 Q. Next one.
5 A. The discharged cartridge case on the
6 sidewalk in relation to the north south linear
7 distance of cartridge case number two is seven
8 feet, not accounting for east west and the last
9 one I took Officer Hill in front of Spaeth's with
10 his arms race in what I call the primed to shoot
11 orientation to the location at the beginning of
12 the asphalt driveway where Officer Hill is seen in
13 frame 257, this is based upon his testimony that
14 he did not -- my recollection is he stated that he
15 did not aim his pistol at Justus Howell until he
16 had reached the driveway. The video to me shows
17 that he exited from behind the tree in front of
18 Spaeth's and he actually had his pistol out
19 pointed at least in a southerly direction 14 feet
20 before the driveway.
21 Q. Before he says he did?
22 A. Yes.
23 Q. And that is because you wanted to make
24 him out to be a liar?

Page 159

1 MR. ODIM: Objection.
2 BY THE WITNESS:
3 A. I'll answer that. I don't want to make
4 anybody out to be a liar. I just want to present
5 the physical evidence the way it is and let the
6 finder of fact make that decision.
7 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
8 Q. Did this last determination, the
9 14 feet measurement, did that play any role in any
10 of your opinions?
11 A. Well, I know I mention in my report
12 that it's inconsistent with Officer Hill's
13 testimony.
14 Q. I know but --
15 A. I mean --
16 Q. In what way is that relevant to any of
17 your opinions?
18 A. Well, it just shows that Officer Hill
19 had his pistol out before he testified that he
20 even saw the gun.
21 Q. Okay. And in what way is that relevant
22 to your opinions?
23 A. Well, I'm just pointing out the
24 scientific facts, what the video shows.

Page 160

1 Q. It doesn't affect your opinion that
2 Officer Hill shot later than he -- you contend his
3 testimony established?
4 A. No. I'm just regard recording -- what
5 I'm doing is I'm documenting a crime scene
6 unfortunately 20 months later, but I'm documenting
7 as best I can based upon the available evidence
8 I've got to look at.
9 Q. There's dozens of things you can
10 document at a scene so you make some evidentiary
11 evaluation as to what you're going to document,
12 correct?
13 MR. ODIM: Objection. That's not what his
14 testimony is.
15 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
16 Q. Correct?
17 A. Like I said, I did this before I went
18 to the scene. What evidentiary value it might
19 have later would be something I would be glad that
20 I took the measurement in case I needed it.
21 Q. And it turned out you really didn't?
22 MR. ODIM: Objection. Is that a question?
23 MR. DiCIANNI: Yes.
24 BY MR. DiCIANNI:

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZIONApril 04, 2017
161-164

Page 161

1 Q. It turns out you really didn't need it,
2 right?
3 A. It is what it is and if I'm asked to
4 testify to it, it's of value to someone else.
5 Q. Your report goes on to discuss -- your
6 opinion goes on to talk about Officer Gildea's
7 location when he heard the gunshots and you
8 believe that contradicts Officer Hill's account of
9 when he fired those shots; is that accurate?
10 A. Yes.
11 Q. You base that on the video, correct?
12 A. On the video and Officer Gildea's
13 testimony.
14 Q. And the video would show that on or
15 around 257 Gildea is still in the video and
16 doesn't disappear from the video until about 273,
17 74?
18 A. Correct.
19 Q. So you want to draw a coordination
20 between when Gildea says he heard the shots and
21 the frames on the video, correct?
22 A. Well, I'm looking at his testimony and
23 I'm comparing it to the frames on the video.
24 Q. This kind of gets back to the question

Page 162

1 that I asked that we talked about earlier about
2 the peril in using testimony or oral statements as
3 forensic evidence. That's what you're doing here,
4 right?
5 A. No.
6 Q. In what way are you not doing that?
7 A. We can see Officer Gildea in the video
8 up to where he disappears from view at
9 approximately 273 to 274. So when we evaluate the
10 testimony that he did not hear the gunshots until
11 he reached the southeast corner, actually it was
12 the south part of the house near the electrical
13 box on 24th Avenue I believe it is that he heard
14 the gunshots. When I look at the distance where
15 Officer Gildea is located in the video and then to
16 where he stated he heard the gunshots, it's a
17 distance of approximately 35 to 40 feet. So what
18 that's telling me is there is an issue of time
19 involved, how long does it take Officer Gildea to
20 cover 40-some odd feet and does that conflict or
21 support the fact that Officer Hill fired at a
22 later time than he claims to have fired. So what
23 I'm pointing out in this is the time frame that it
24 takes Officer Gildea to leave the video, go out of

Page 163

1 side of the video until he gets around to the
2 south side of the house. That's the approximate
3 time that officer Howell is obstructed by the tree
4 and that's the point at which the victim is on the
5 ground.
6 Q. Did you measure his strides in the
7 video?
8 A. I did not.
9 Q. Are you familiar with any studies that
10 would support the conclusion you made in this case
11 that Officer Gildea's testimony would be reliable
12 forensic evidence to base an opinion on in this
13 instance?
14 A. I know there's studies on police
15 officers' physical standards and there are studies
16 on athletes covering getting to first base,
17 et cetera so I try to make a logical conclusion
18 based upon that.
19 Q. Did you apply any of those studies?
20 A. I did.
21 Q. Which ones?
22 A. Well, I took the amount of time it
23 would take the average person to cover
24 approximately 40 feet and it's about one to one

Page 164

1 and a half seconds.
2 Q. What about an officer who is carrying
3 gear?
4 A. I didn't account for that.
5 Q. Are you familiar with any of the
6 studies about the time it takes an officer
7 carrying gear to travel from A to B on foot?
8 A. I didn't use those in this shooting
9 incident.
10 Q. Are you aware of any of the studies on
11 the effect of -- let me rephrase that.
12 Are you familiar with any of the
13 studies that discuss the discrepancy between the
14 actual and the recalled path of travel of
15 witnesses?
16 MR. ODIM: Objection. Foundation.
17 BY THE WITNESS:
18 A. I think that's beyond the role of my
19 retainment in this case.
20 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
21 Q. So you didn't apply any of those
22 studies?
23 A. I did not.
24 Q. You did not apply any study regarding a

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZIONApril 04, 2017
165-168

Page 165

1 standard deviation from time travel on foot that
2 results from a person being in a conflict
3 situation and trying to remember the details?
4 MR. ODIM: Objection. Foundation and totally
5 ambiguous.
6 BY THE WITNESS:
7 A. I did not apply that.
8 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
9 Q. So putting all of your conclusions
10 together, based on all of the evidence that you
11 considered, tell us what you think happened in
12 this case.
13 MR. ODIM: Objection. This witness has given
14 certain opinions, those opinions are encompassed
15 in this report. The question goes way beyond what
16 he is stating an opinion about.
17 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
18 Q. Go ahead.
19 A. My report stands for itself.
20 Q. So if I can summarize it, you believe
21 that Officer Hill shot -- well, strike that.
22 You've testified earlier about based on
23 your opinions when the left-sided shot took place
24 in the frames, correct, which frames those shots

Page 166

1 had taken place in?
2 A. Yes.
3 Q. And then you testified before regarding
4 which of the frames the right sided shot could
5 have taken place in, correct?
6 A. I think I made an exclusion on one part
7 of that based upon the posture of Mr. Howell. I
8 don't recall what the frames were but I recall
9 that.
10 Q. When you say exclusion, you mean that
11 you only identify the frames where the right-sided
12 shot couldn't have occurred?
13 A. Correct.
14 Q. So you're not -- you're unable to say
15 with any degree of scientific certainty when the
16 right sided shot could have occurred?
17 A. I think I did point out some
18 possibilities where his orientation and the
19 posture of his body made it possible for those
20 trajectory rods to line up with the muzzle of the
21 gun.
22 Q. I don't recall that, but I know we've
23 been through it. So I don't think we need to go
24 through it again.

Page 167

1 I know you excluded it as something you
2 considered and you relied on in arriving at your
3 opinions, but tell me what Item J is on your
4 source materials, the reports of measurements by
5 the Lake County major crimes task force?
6 A. There is a document I believe it's
7 called that, measurements by the Lake County task
8 force, I looked at that document and in my opinion
9 it was completely no reference point, no diagram,
10 no diagram of where evidence was located,
11 measurements from the middle of the yard to
12 another point, basically they were of no value
13 whatsoever.
14 Q. Is that in your records, those
15 measurements?
16 A. I have the document. I copied it over.
17 It's on the disk.
18 Q. It's on the disk?
19 A. It's on the disk.
20 Q. Let's pull it up.
21 A. When I copied it over, the properties
22 did not copy.
23 MS. MORAN: Off the record for a minute.
24 (WHEREUPON, discussion was had off

Page 168

1 the record.)
2 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
3 Q. No. 67, Biodynamics Engineering, do you
4 know what that is?
5 A. I don't know what that is. I didn't
6 use it.
7 Q. Could you pull that up? So earlier I'd
8 asked you about whether you had seen or relied on
9 or responded to a computer diagram such as this,
10 right, and you said you didn't?
11 A. Yes, and that was incorrect now that I
12 see it but I don't remember looking at this.
13 Q. You didn't analyze it in any way?
14 A. No, I didn't.
15 Q. Why not?
16 A. Because I'm doing an independent
17 examination.
18 MS. MORAN: For the record, you referred to
19 it as an animation earlier.
20 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
21 Q. You knew what I meant?
22 A. Actually I didn't.
23 Q. You didn't?
24 A. Right.

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
169-172

Page 169

1 MS. MORAN: He told you he didn't at the time
2 as the report will reflect.
3 BY MR. DICIANNI:
4 Q. What we just looked at bioengineering,
5 that's not J?
6 A. That's not J.
7 Q. We want to pull up J and see what that
8 is.
9 What would it be listed as on your
10 files?
11 A. I'm going to take a guess here. It
12 might be in the technician reports. Measurements,
13 Kueber's measurements, that's probably it there.
14 Q. Is that what J is?
15 A. Yes, that's one of them.
16 Q. What's the other one?
17 A. That's the other one. There's no
18 reference point. It's meaningless.
19 Q. What was Honda Fit?
20 A. I don't know.
21 Q. You didn't use it or refer to it for
22 any of your opinions?
23 A. I looked at it but I didn't use it.
24 Q. You disagree that using testimony or

Page 170

1 using a witness statement is an inappropriate use
2 of -- it's inappropriate to use a witness
3 statement or testimony as forensic evidence?
4 MR. ODIM: Objection. Asked and answered.
5 BY THE WITNESS:
6 A. I don't use witness statements as the
7 basis for scientific conclusions, correct.
8 BY MR. DICIANNI:
9 Q. But you use them as forensic evidence?
10 A. I use them -- I would compare the
11 scientific evidence to the statements to see
12 whether they agree.
13 Q. Okay. You did that with Gildea's
14 statement, right?
15 A. I did that -- I took Gildea's statement
16 and I took the video and the distance factor and I
17 synchronized that.
18 Q. Why didn't you read the witness
19 statements that confirm that Justus was running
20 with a gun in his hand down Galilee?
21 A. Witness statements?
22 Q. Are you aware there's witnesses who saw
23 him running down the street with a gun in his
24 hand?

Page 171

1 A. Civilian witnesses?
2 Q. Yes.
3 A. I understand there were. I'm not
4 familiar with their statements.
5 Q. Why wouldn't you have reviewed those
6 and used that as forensic evidence to shed light
7 on your opinion regarding Howell running down the
8 street with a gun in his hand?
9 A. Actually I think you just answered your
10 own question with the previous question. I
11 wouldn't use witness statements by themselves, in
12 and of themselves I wouldn't use witness
13 statements.
14 Q. You would use a witness statement in
15 connection with the video, correct?
16 A. Because they're in the video.
17 Q. Who is in the video?
18 A. Officer Gildea is in the video.
19 Q. That's how you make -- that's where you
20 draw the line, if he's in the video you'll use his
21 statement as forensic evidence?
22 A. Well, it shows where he is. It's
23 evidence.
24 Q. Your opinion that the video does not

Page 172

1 show Howell turning in the way that Hill describes
2 it in his deposition, how would you test that
3 opinion?
4 A. By looking at the demonstration done by
5 Officer Hill and then looking at the video and
6 seeing if I can see the same or similar turn which
7 I tested.
8 Q. So it's what you did?
9 A. It's what I did and I couldn't find it.
10 Q. And your opinion that Hill fired later
11 than you believe his testimony demonstrates, how
12 would you test that?
13 A. By the location of the discharged
14 cartridge cases, by the synchronization of the
15 trajectory rods from the autopsy in conjunction
16 with the posture of Mr. Howell at the point that
17 Officer Hill stated that he shot him.
18 Q. Now you didn't do anything to test
19 those opinions outside of your review of the
20 evidence, correct?
21 A. Correct.
22 Q. So looking at your CV, you were in the
23 military?
24 A. I was.

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
173-176

Page 173

1 Q. And that would have been from '63 to
2 '66?
3 A. Yes, sir.
4 Q. And did you see combat?
5 A. I did.
6 Q. Where?
7 A. Dominican Republic 1965.
8 Q. What was that?
9 A. That was called Operation Power Pack.
10 I can't recall too much about it. I was only 18,
11 19 at the time. The armed forces had been sent
12 down to protect I believe it was American students
13 that attending school in the Dominican Republic
14 and to withdraw them from what was a civil
15 insurrection at the time.
16 Q. Did you actually get into some type of
17 a fight?
18 A. I was in combat.
19 Q. Did you shoot somebody?
20 A. I did.
21 Q. Who did you shoot?
22 A. I don't know who it was.
23 Q. Was it one of the rebels?
24 A. It was.

Page 174

1 Q. What were the circumstances?
2 A. Shot him with a 50 caliber machine gun,
3 two of them.
4 Q. What were they doing?
5 A. They were shooting out of the window of
6 the Holiday Inn hotel at us.
7 Q. You were on the ground?
8 A. I was on the ground.
9 Q. Did you fire up into the window at
10 them?
11 A. Yes.
12 Q. Did you get them?
13 A. Yes.
14 Q. How do you know?
15 A. Fell out of the window.
16 Q. Any other types of combat?
17 A. No.
18 Q. When you got out of the Army in '66,
19 what did you do?
20 A. I went into mechanical engineering at
21 the General Electric company, went through the
22 apprenticeship program, a combination of
23 mechanical engineering and learning manufacturing
24 processes, manufacturing jet engines.

Page 175

1 Q. When did you start college?
2 A. Well, I started junior college right
3 after I got out of the service, is sometime I
4 believe in 1967, actually during mechanical
5 engineering program that was also considered part
6 of college, part of Wentworth Institute.
7 Q. You worked for General Electric it was?
8 A. Yes, it was.
9 Q. You were a full-time employee?
10 A. Yes.
11 Q. And you joined the Massachusetts State
12 Police in 1973?
13 A. Yes, I did.
14 Q. Was that directly from General
15 Electric?
16 A. No, it was not.
17 Q. What did you do in between?
18 A. In between I had know position in
19 mechanical engineering. I worked for a large firm
20 out of New York, rise letter lap incorporation,
21 heating ventilating air conditioning on a 35 story
22 office tower building doing mechanical work.
23 Q. You don't have an engineering degree?
24 A. No, no.

Page 176

1 Q. No engineering certificates?
2 A. I didn't complete it. Then I went into
3 accounting and finance, career change.
4 Q. Another career change to go into the
5 police?
6 A. Yes, I did.
7 Q. Was that your first law enforcement job
8 in Massachusetts?
9 A. Yes, it was.
10 Q. You weren't military police or anything
11 like that?
12 A. No.
13 Q. So you served according to your CV as
14 a -- would it be a patrol officer from '73 to '79?
15 A. I served in a rural State Police
16 barracks. We had very little patrol. We did
17 police services, the towns are very small; they
18 had no police department, in the evening and
19 midnight hours.
20 Q. What town was it?
21 A. There was a number of towns. I can
22 list them for you if you want.
23 Q. Where were you born and raised?
24 A. I was born in Lynn, Massachusetts,

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
177-180

Page 177

1 L-y-n-n.
2 Q. Is that where you lived until college?
3 A. I moved to Peabody, Massachusetts.
4 Q. In '79 you went to the ballistics
5 section of the Massachusetts State Police?
6 A. Correct.
7 Q. And you served there until '92 when you
8 became the shift commander at JHQ?
9 A. Correct.
10 Q. What were your duties there?
11 A. At GHQ?
12 Q. Yes.
13 A. I was in charge of the 9/11 system,
14 civilian dispatchers, state wide dispatch system
15 and I was overseeing the deployment of resources
16 to local police department, helicopter, SWAT
17 teams, et cetera.
18 Q. So that did not involve forensic
19 evaluations or analysis?
20 A. I was continuing to do some old cases
21 at the time and I did internal police shooting
22 investigations.
23 Q. As part of -- in a supervisory role?
24 A. Yes.

Page 178

1 Q. Did you do the actual investigation
2 yourself or you got reports from the investigators
3 and make decisions based on that?
4 A. I did the actual internal
5 investigation.
6 Q. It looks like from '92 until you left
7 in would it have been '98?
8 A. 1998.
9 Q. You did not have a role as an
10 investigator?
11 A. I did. An internal investigator.
12 Q. I see. Staff inspector position?
13 A. And in the positions of shift
14 commander, I conducted internal investigations,
15 mostly misconduct and civilian complaints.
16 Q. So the majority of your experience in
17 forensic evidence evaluation took place from '79
18 to '92 in the ballistic section, at least when you
19 were a police officer?
20 A. The forensic aspect of it and my
21 independent work since 2002.
22 Q. From '92 until you left the department
23 you were basically an administrator?
24 A. Yes, I was considered a commissioned

Page 179

1 officer.
2 Q. But you were in an administrative role?
3 A. Yes.
4 Q. Why did you leave in '98?
5 A. My wife and I had the business that she
6 still has, it was Eclipse Signs and Truck
7 Lettering at the time and I had finish my 25 years
8 and four months and it was time to move on to the
9 next phase of my life.
10 Q. Her business is truck lettering?
11 A. Signs and truck lettering.
12 Q. She makes signs?
13 A. Gold leaf signs, window lettering,
14 boats, planes, trailer trucks, airplanes.
15 Q. She did that in Massachusetts and then
16 in Arizona?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. Still does?
19 A. Still does.
20 Q. You have as professional employment
21 from '67 to -- when did you start your business?
22 A. 2002.
23 Q. What did you do from '98 to '02?
24 A. I worked with my wife in the signs and

Page 180

1 truck lettering business. I did a few cases for
2 some attorneys that I knew but very few. I'm
3 talking less than probably less than 15.
4 Q. Did you do any consultation, expert
5 witness type consultation while you were a police
6 officer?
7 A. Not permitted.
8 Q. So you didn't start doing that until
9 you left?
10 A. Correct.
11 Q. Did you do any of that in
12 Massachusetts?
13 A. I did not.
14 Q. So before you actually set up what
15 would be a formal business, you did some
16 consultation occasionally?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. And then in '02 you launched your
19 business?
20 A. That's correct.
21 Q. Have you ever had any partners?
22 A. I have not.
23 Q. Have you ever had any employees?
24 A. Well, I don't want to consider my wife

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
181-184

Page 181

1 an employee, but she helps me on occasion with
2 some of the administrative and she's the
3 accountant shall we say.
4 Q. Other than that, no employees?
5 A. That's correct.
6 Q. And that's been the case since you
7 started the business?
8 A. Correct.
9 Q. How many cases a year do you generally
10 handle roughly?
11 A. It's been -- it's increased over the
12 last five years significantly. I average over the
13 last five years 40 to 50 cases, 35 to 45 cases per
14 year.
15 Q. These would all be litigation
16 consultations?
17 A. Criminal cases. Some of them involve
18 working with architects and engineers conducting
19 testing. I do work for the military.
20 Q. I'll include all of that in litigation,
21 if there is a case involved, criminal, civil --
22 A. I do some voluntary work for innocence
23 projects and families on occasion.
24 Q. You don't teach?

Page 182

1 A. I try to do one presentation per year
2 if time permits. It's been difficult.
3 Q. Have you published at all?
4 A. I do not publish.
5 Q. Never published?
6 A. Never published.
7 Q. Why not?
8 A. First of all, with the State Police it
9 was prohibited by the rules and regulations and I
10 prefer to give scientific oral verbal
11 presentations with abstracts as opposed to formal
12 publications.
13 Q. On Page 4 of your report you say you've
14 personally conducted of generally accepted tests
15 for terming discharged cartridge case ejection
16 patterns including actual testing of semiautomatic
17 pistols, full automatic pistols and machine guns
18 and submachine guns. That's an accurate
19 statement?
20 A. Yes, it is.
21 Q. Where did you conduct these tests?
22 A. I conduct them currently as needed.
23 The majority of them I conducted with the
24 Massachusetts State Police, and I've worked with

Page 183

1 the military on some prototype weapons.
2 Q. Did you do any of these tests in
3 connection with cases you were consulting on?
4 A. Yes.
5 Q. How many of them approximately?
6 A. Since 2002?
7 Q. Yes.
8 A. Or are you including State Police?
9 Q. No, since '02.
10 A. I would say less than 50.
11 Q. So 50 times you were asked to give an
12 opinion regarding some ejection issue, and you did
13 a test?
14 A. I misunderstood your question.
15 I've given testimony on ejection
16 patterns without conducting tests, but in 50 cases
17 or less, I've actually conducted the actual
18 testing.
19 Q. In connection with your consultation?
20 A. Right.
21 Q. I did understand.
22 Why have you not published anything
23 regarding your tests?
24 A. I just don't care to publish material.

Page 184

1 I prefer scientific presentations.
2 Q. Well, on Page 5 you say you have
3 presented peer-reviewed scientific forensic
4 presentations at numerous college and
5 universities, seminars for district attorneys and
6 private attorneys, et cetera. I'm not understand
7 peer-reviewed in that context.
8 What do you mean by peer-reviewed?
9 A. This goes outside of the scope of
10 ejection pattern testing?
11 Q. Yes.
12 A. Okay. So this would include all
13 forensic testing, tool marks, gunshot distance
14 determination, how it's done, the generally
15 accepted methodology, determining shooter
16 orientation, movement of the muzzle of the gun how
17 much does that mean being off target at various
18 distances, talking about evidence collection,
19 preservation, talking with EMTs, describing to
20 them that when they see gunshot holes in clothing,
21 preferably they wouldn't take the scissors, that
22 type of work, and then I've been over to the
23 colleges and universities at the request of some
24 of the professors, a lot of the district attorneys

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
185-188

Page 185

1 and assistant district attorneys were adjunct
2 professors. I've been over to Harvard with Dr. --
3 Professor Dershowitz, moot court for the students,
4 that type of thing.
5 Q. I get the picture.
6 I guess what I don't understand is how
7 are these presentations peer-reviewed?
8 A. Oh, they were approved the State Police
9 approved -- the State Police would get a request.
10 I would prepare an abstract. The abstract would
11 be reviewed for accuracy and then be approved for
12 me to, then, present it.
13 Q. In your State Police days?
14 **A. Yes.**
15 Q. Not since then?
16 A. Since then I just submit abstracts to a
17 committee such as the American Academy of Forensic
18 Sciences, and it's reviewed by them.
19 Q. And they invite you to speak?
20 A. They review the abstract and then they
21 make a decision whether or not I can present it.
22 Q. You consider that peer-reviewed?
23 **A. Yes.**
24 Q. Going to your case list, first of all,

Page 186

1 you didn't give us bill records, you said you
2 charge \$395 an hour, is that generally what you
3 charge for all of your consultation cases?
4 **A. Yes.**
5 Q. That's what you're charging in this
6 case?
7 **A. Yes.**
8 Q. Did that includes whatever the task is
9 that you perform in connection with the case?
10 A. My travel time is at a lower rate,
11 and out-of-pocket expenses would be just at
12 cost.
13 Q. But your \$395 per hour applies to
14 testimony, to whatever you're doing?
15 A. Professional work, correct.
16 Q. How many hours have you put in in this
17 case so far?
18 A. I don't know if I can tell you the
19 hours. I can tell you the amount.
20 Q. Okay. What's the amount?
21 A. Which includes out-of-pocket expenses,
22 I think have received a total of \$14,000 which
23 includes part of this travel for this deposition
24 and from that would be approximately \$3,000 in

Page 187

1 out-of-pocket airfare, expenses, lodging,
2 et cetera.
3 Q. So about 11,000 in fees?
4 A. I think so, yes.
5 **Q. Roughly?**
6 **A. Yes.**
7 Q. Do you keep time records?
8 A. I do, right.
9 Q. Is there a software program you use?
10 A. I use a software program.
11 Q. What's it called?
12 A. I actually developed it on Microsoft
13 Word for Windows. I developed my own program.
14 Q. Do you have all your task activities
15 that you itemized?
16 A. I do.
17 Q. So 11,000 in fees and that doesn't
18 include today?
19 A. It does not include today.
20 Q. And it would not include any work going
21 forward or any trial testimony, correct?
22 A. That's correct.
23 Q. Are you expecting to do a rebuttal
24 opinion in this case based on any experts we might

Page 188

1 disclose?
2 MR. ODIM: Objection. There's been no
3 disclosure of anything.
4 BY MR. DiCIANNI:
5 Q. That wasn't my question. Go ahead.
6 You can answer.
7 A. I have not been asked to do anything
8 beyond this deposition.
9 Q. What do you roughly make per case,
10 roughly? What would be an average amount that you
11 would charge per case?
12 A. It's going to depend upon the evidence
13 and the complexity of it. I think it could
14 average from -- I think the most in one case was
15 over \$30,000 and there are some cases I do pro
16 bono, but it's anywheres in between, but I would
17 say that I think the best way I could put it is
18 15 hours would be what my starting point would be,
19 I do the best I can within that and then if more
20 time is necessary, I work from there.
21 Q. So 50 an hour is on the simplest type
22 of case and \$30,000 would be the more -- the most
23 complex type of case?
24 A. Yeah, and that includes travel like to

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
189-192

Page 189

1 Florida and very complex testing.
2 Q. How does this case rank in terms of
3 complexity? Is it at the top end or the low end?
4 A. It's not complex to me. I don't want
5 to say it's on the low end, but it's less than
6 medium.
7 Q. So below the middle?
8 **A. Yes.**
9 Q. I want to look at your case list.
10 We talked earlier in the deposition
11 about Daubert consultations that you've done and
12 one of the things you mentioned the Linda Frias
13 case?
14 **A. Correct.**
15 Q. And you mentioned the Babbitt case on
16 the following page, correct?
17 **A. Yes.**
18 Q. And you mentioned that this list would
19 refresh your memory about other Daubert
20 consultations you've done?
21 A. Yes, it would.
22 Q. So I'm going to ask you to tell us
23 which cases on this list would be cases where you
24 did a Daubert consultation?

Page 190

1 A. First page December 2016, AZ versus
2 Nicholas Lopez in Gila County. It's listed as a
3 Daubert hearing. Frias case has already been
4 testified to, D. Babbitt I testified to, that's on
5 the second page. I'm not sure about Arizona
6 versus Cory Candler. I know I testified at a
7 trial. I'm not sure if there was a Daubert
8 hearing involved during the trial.
9 Q. Which one?
10 A. About half way down, January 2016, AZ
11 versus Cory Candler.
12 Q. Arizona follows Daubert I assume?
13 A. Yes, it does.
14 Q. What else?
15 A. December of 2014, N.G. and L.G. Minors
16 by and through their Guardian ad Litem, et cetera,
17 it's plaintiff's versus the county of Los Angeles,
18 that included a Daubert issue. I don't recall
19 actually testifying at it, but there was a Daubert
20 motion before the court.
21 Q. When you say a Daubert motion, are any
22 of these cases where you were being challenged
23 based on Daubert, some of them were?
24 A. Yes, yes.

Page 191

1 Q. Not where you were brought in to be a
2 consultant where somebody else is challenging an
3 expert?
4 A. Correct. Let's see. October of 2014
5 I'm not sure, Munoz, I did not testify but there
6 may have been a Daubert issue for me, but I did
7 not testify except at a deposition. March 2014,
8 this is in numerical order by date, Torres versus
9 Albuquerque Police Department, that was a Daubert
10 hearing and a bench trial combined. I testified
11 at that.
12 Q. Daubert challenge to your testimony?
13 A. Correct, yes. The January 2014,
14 Kentucky versus Pharo Wilson. My recollection is
15 I have it listed as a trial, but I believe there
16 was a Daubert issue involved in that at the time.
17 Q. Again, challenging your testimony?
18 A. Challenging my testimony. As a matter
19 of fact, it's actually listed in the next -- it's
20 in the next line, it says Daubert hearing.
21 Q. Sure.
22 A. That's it.
23 Q. Have you ever done a Daubert
24 consultation where you were the person who was

Page 192

1 challenging somebody else's testimony?
2 A. I have.
3 Q. Is it on this list?
4 A. They've occurred prior to that.
5 Q. Prior to this?
6 **A. Yes.**
7 Q. Do you remember the names?
8 A. I would have to go back to my files. I
9 know one was in Indiana. I don't remember the
10 name of the case.
11 Q. Do you remember the area of forensic
12 examination that was involved?
13 A. Tool marks, tool mark identification.
14 Q. Has your testimony ever been excluded?
15 **A. No.**
16 **Q. Never?**
17 **A. No.**
18 Q. What about on the Sam Pomier case, was
19 your evidence excluded in that case?
20 A. I don't recall a Daubert hearing, but I
21 testified in that case.
22 Q. So have you ever had part of your
23 testimony excluded?
24 A. Not from a qualification perspective.

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
193-196

Page 193

1 There have been some rulings where the content of
2 my testimony was excluded for whatever reason, the
3 judge decided is that it was not to be admitted to
4 the jury.
5 MR. DiCIANNI: I'm going to take a break. We
6 may be done.
7 (WHEREUPON, a recess was had.)
8 MR. DiCIANNI: We don't have further
9 questions.
10 MR. ODIM: No questions. We're reserving
11 signature.
12 FURTHER DEPONENT SAITH NOT.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Page 194

1 DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET
2 Assignment No. J0540621
3 ALICE HOWELL, Independent)
4 Administrator of the Estate)
5 of JUSTUS HOWELL,)
6 Plaintiff,) No. 16 CV 3949
7 -vs-)
8 CITY OF ZION, a municipal)
9 corporation, OFFICER ERIC)
10 HILL, (#47),)
11 Defendants.)
12 DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY
13 I declare under penalty of perjury that
14 I have read the entire transcript of my deposition
15 taken in the captioned matter or the same has been
16 read to me, and the same is true and accurate,
17 save and except for changes and/or corrections, if
18 any, as indicated by me on the DEPOSITION ERRATA
19 SHEET hereof, with the understanding that I offer
20 these changes as if still under oath.
21 Signed on the ____ day of
22 _____, 20 ____.
23 _____
24 RONALD SCOTT

Page 195

1 DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET
2 Page No. Line No. Change to:
3 _____
4 Reason for change:
5 Page No. Line No. Change to:
6 _____
7 Reason for
8 change:
9 Page No. Line No. Change to:
10 _____
11 Reason for change:
12 Page No. Line No. Change to:
13 _____
14 Reason for change:
15 Page No. Line No. Change to:
16 _____
17 Reason for change:
18 Page No. Line No. Change to:
19 _____
20 Reason for change:
21 _____
22 _____
23 SIGNATURE: DATE:
24 RONALD SCOTT

Page 196

1 DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET
2 Page No. Line No. Change to:
3 _____
4 Reason for change:
5 Page No. Line No. Change to:
6 _____
7 Reason for change:
8 Page No. Line No. Change to:
9 _____
10 Reason for change:
11 Page No. Line No. Change to:
12 _____
13 Reason for change:
14 Page No. Line No. Change to:
15 _____
16 Reason for change:
17 Page No. Line No. Change to:
18 _____
19 Reason for change:
20 Page No. Line No. Change to:
21 _____
22 Reason for change:
23 SIGNATURE: DATE:
24 RONALD SCOTT

**RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION**

**April 04, 2017
197-199**

Page 197	Page 199
<p>1 STATE OF ILLINOIS) 2) SS: 3 COUNTY OF K A N E) 4 I, THERESA A. VORKAPIC, a Notary Public 5 within and for the County of Kane, State of 6 Illinois, and a Certified Shorthand Reporter, CSR 7 License No. 84-2589, of said state, do hereby 8 certify: 9 That previous to the commencement of 10 the examination of the witness, the witness was 11 duly sworn to testify the whole truth concerning 12 the matters herein; 13 That the foregoing deposition 14 transcript was reported stenographically by me, 15 was thereafter reduced to typewriting under my 16 personal direction and constitutes a true record 17 of the testimony given and the proceedings had; 18 That reading and signing was requested; 19 that the said deposition was taken before me at 20 the time and place specified; 21 That I am not a relative or employee or 22 attorney or counsel, nor a relative or employee of 23 such attorney or counsel for any of the parties 24 hereto, nor interested directly or indirectly in</p>	<p>1 EXAMINATION 2 3 RONALD R. SCOTT 4 Examination 5 By Mr. DiCianni 6 7 8 E X H I B I T S 9 Exhibit No. 1 20 17 10 Exhibit No. 2 82 17 11 Exhibit No. 3 96 3 12 Exhibit No. 4 98 5 13 Exhibit No. 5 147 9 14 Exhibit Nos. 6 & 7 155 22 15 ***ORIGINAL EXHIBITS RETAINED BY COUNSEL*** 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24</p>
Page 198	
<p>1 the outcome of this action. 2 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I do hereunto set 3 my hand of office at Chicago, Illinois, this 16th 4 day of April, 2017. 5 6 7 Theresa A. Vorkapic 8 Notary Public, Kane County, 9 Illinois. 10 My commission expires 11/6/19. 11 12 13 CSR License No. 84-2589. 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24</p>	

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: \$14,000..256

	105:17	1/8th	173:11	2014
\$	023	136:4,6	1965	190:15
	105:17,23	137:8,14,	173:7	191:4,7,
\$14,000	024	15,19,22	1967	13
186:22	105:17	139:3,9	175:4	2016
\$3,000	027	142:18	1973	22:6
186:24	111:21	10	175:12	190:1,10
\$30,000	028	50:11	1979	21
188:15,22	111:21	100	8:24 9:1	87:4
\$395	029	6:14	1980	95:16
186:2,13	104:14	10:00	8:6	150:11,16
	109:5,7,9	107:4	1987	151:6
0	110:2,3,	10th	133:5	212
	12	9:11	1988	74:9
008	030	11	133:5	213
111:21	104:14	79:3 80:3	1990	74:11
113:6,8	109:5	89:7	8:7,13,14	214
009	031	11,000	1990s	74:10
111:21	104:14	187:3,17	19:20	231
010	105:14,18	12	1998	117:21
111:21	109:5,6	91:20,24	178:8	118:3
011	110:19	92:7,8,14	1:15	24
104:11	04/04/2017	94:10	97:6,7	140:3
109:7	20:19	118:13	1:20	240
113:7,8	82:19	129:14	97:9	80:2,3,16
012	96:5 98:6	12-foot		82:21
104:11	147:11	154:6,7		83:1
109:7	155:24	12:15	2	24th
013	1	97:4,9		162:13
104:11		14	2	25
109:7	1	158:19	82:15,18	144:9,19
02	20:15,18	159:9	117:17,18	179:7
104:14	128:14,17	15	20	252
179:23	1/16th	151:2	19:22	80:3
180:18	136:4,6	180:3	127:1	256
183:9	137:8,15,	188:18	160:6	50:8
021	19,22	18	2002	51:4,11
104:12	1/3	173:10	12:7	55:5,12,
022	151:1	19	178:21	14,20,22,
104:12		150:11,15	179:22	23 56:6,
			183:6	18 58:1,

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: 257..837

15	264	91:3 94:8	44	110:13
257	80:4	99:24	10:24	112:24
39:23,24	27-inch	102:1	45	60-degree
40:1	84:3	103:16	146:8	90:13
44:20	270	109:24	181:13	94:20
45:20	80:4	110:13	45-degree	102:1
46:9,12,	273	111:7	105:9	103:17
15 47:4,	161:16	112:23	46	110:1
9,23	162:9	113:21	10:23	111:8
48:16,24	274	30-degree	47	113:21
50:1,8,	162:9	94:20	157:2	63
14,21	275	300	49	173:1
51:8,11	80:4	5:22,23	157:2	66
55:5,13,	118:23	304		173:2
15 56:2,	28-inch	120:20	5	174:18
11 58:15	84:5	309		67
80:4	281	120:19	5	168:3
118:9	33:16	31	78:22	179:21
124:18,23	34:5,6,24	34	147:7,10,	7
125:1	282	142:14	13 184:2	
144:10	120:5	35	5/100ths	7
148:8	285	162:17	58:2	155:23
150:4,18,	33:17	175:21	50	72
21	34:6	181:13	5:18	10:24
151:10,23	120:6	37881	157:2	73
152:20	287	9:11	174:2	176:14
153:6	33:17		181:13	74
158:13	34:1,6,	4	183:10,	161:17
161:15	15,20		11,16	75
258	120:7	4	188:21	6:5,13
118:10,19	292	98:2,5,20	6	79
259	120:12	99:17		176:14
117:21	3	182:13	6	177:4
118:3,10		40	155:23	178:17
26	262	162:17	6/100ths	
127:20	3	163:24	58:2	8
128:20	27:18	181:13	60	
149:14,17	96:1,4	40-some	91:3 94:9	837
153:6	30	162:20	99:24	155:10
	90:13		109:24	

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: 9/11..aim

	17:18	138:4	178:23	132:5
9	24:21	activities	admissibili	143:3,21
	182:14	49:2	ty	affects
	184:15	187:14	41:13	146:24
9/11				
177:13	account	actual	admissible	affiliated
	106:17	21:11	19:9	27:10
90-degree	126:2	60:7	admitted	afraid
90:16	142:13	102:7	193:3	95:23
105:8	146:5	108:4		
92	161:8	129:19	adult	agency
177:7	164:4	149:2	10:21	13:5
178:6,18,	accountable	164:14	advertise	ages
22	113:15	178:1,4	12:16	10:22
98	accountant	182:16	13:14	aggregate
178:7	11:3	183:17	advertiseme	109:17
179:4,23	181:3	acute	nt	agree
	accounting	116:6	14:2	17:9
A	156:14	ad	advertising	33:21
	158:8	190:16	13:18	36:3 39:9
ability	176:3	added	advice	41:16,24
30:23	accounts	151:2	15:21	47:7
61:8	150:15	additional	advocacy	58:14
109:18	accuracy	13:3	79:19	62:5 66:5
abrasion	185:11	54:20,21	affect	67:16
104:21,23	accurate	77:18	42:19	73:19
105:11	48:17	125:22	43:16	74:1
absence	107:24	address	60:23	87:5,10,
54:3	108:20,22	9:11	67:10,13,	12 127:23
absent	109:14	143:10	17 86:8	140:14
107:2	111:3,5	adjourn	123:13,19	170:12
Absolutely	137:17	84:8	124:2,10	agreement
79:18	152:16	adjunct	130:17	49:17
abstract	161:9	185:1	131:2	agrees
185:10,20	182:18	adjust	132:21	72:3
abstracts	accurately	82:12	135:21	ahead
182:11	106:11,12	administrat	137:4,7	41:17
185:16	acknowledge	ive	138:2	43:2 45:5
	43:23	179:2	139:1	150:8
Academy	act	181:2	143:5,15	157:19
14:11	6:13	administrat	160:1	165:18
185:17	action	or	affected	188:5
accepted	132:11		130:23	aim
			131:22	158:15

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: air..arm

air 175:21	analysis 15:5 24:19 45:16 152:13 177:19	118:23 119:5,13 121:11 139:16 154:14	54:6,17	approximate on 91:21
airfare 187:1			applied 138:18	approximate ons 92:10,11
airplanes 179:14	analyst 28:6	angles 29:2 35:10 36:2 42:18 86:16,21 95:7 101:10, 17,23 103:12, 13,14 104:9 110:10 111:14 114:5 118:17,19 119:4,5	apply 59:5 138:21,22 145:16 163:19 164:21,24 165:7	arc 91:5,7 156:9
Albuquerque 191:9	analyze 168:13			architects 11:19 181:18
alleged 19:15	anatomical 114:23			
allowance 150:21	Andrew 31:2,12		applying 46:3 49:21 50:2 59:19	area 22:7 27:24 28:13 50:12 105:21 108:16 120:7 126:1 136:8 137:20 144:4 156:10 192:11
allowed 14:20 27:4 149:19 150:21	Angeles 190:17		apprentices hip 174:22	
alteration 136:2 139:2	angle 51:3 57:22 86:22 90:5,12, 14,18,22 91:1,3,6, 13,23 92:12 94:19 95:2,4,9 100:1 103:17,18 104:14, 18,19 105:3,7, 8,9 106:4,23, 24 107:5, 18,22 108:13,20 109:4,10, 13,18,24 110:1,5 111:8,22 112:8,12 113:11 114:19	animation 122:2 168:19	approved 185:8,9, 11	
altered 131:14		Anna 8:9	approximate 163:2	
alternative 94:23 127:3		anticipate 55:18	approximate ly 5:22 22:8 34:15 64:4 90:23 91:22 133:12 142:14 144:15 149:14,15 157:2 162:9,17 163:24 183:5 186:24	areas 15:3,14, 18 25:20, 21 53:24
ambiguous 87:21 165:5		anticipatin g 13:20		arguing 85:11,13
American 14:11,18 173:12 185:17		anywheres 188:16		Arizona 9:9 18:9, 10 20:3 84:8 179:16 190:5,12
ammunition 29:3		appears 106:22 112:15		
amount 58:7 137:12 147:3 163:22 186:19,20 188:10		applicable 16:2		arm 50:24 51:5 56:10,15 72:14
		application 24:18 47:20 53:15		

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: armed..back

73:4	aspect	assuming	13	163:23
74:11	19:4	40:9		181:12
75:13,24	25:3,23	42:21	authorities	188:10,14
76:1,3,7	52:5	140:18,20	27:17	
77:10	61:11	142:2,6	automatic	averages
115:8	67:7 71:1		146:8	145:2
armed	77:18	assumption	182:17	aware
33:8,9,13	125:22	131:19		25:11
173:11	178:20	141:20	autopsy	26:1,4
			30:20	27:7
arms	aspects	athletes	31:17,21	47:3,5
72:22	11:18	163:16	32:1 35:9	125:6
119:9	20:23	attached	36:1	132:19
141:4	21:5	91:11	42:17	138:12
142:8,12,	25:21	attack	43:9	164:10
14 158:10	28:18	69:4	45:12,22	170:22
Army	29:5 39:3	attempt	46:6,22,	
174:18	42:1 49:1	100:10	24 47:8,	AZ
	125:19		20 49:22	190:1,10
arrival	asphalt	attempting	50:2	AZARI
125:24	50:18	69:4	64:10	155:10
149:19	158:12	attending	65:11,20	
		173:13	86:21	<hr/> B <hr/>
arrive	assistance	attorney	89:8,21	
10:7	148:10	9:22	94:19	
49:20	assistant	22:10	95:5,8,	Babbitt
50:6	185:1	30:5	19,20	18:9,23
104:9	Associate	37:14	96:8	19:18
arrived	8:19	38:11	98:14	189:15
99:22	associates	128:5	99:2,21	190:4
arriving	12:12	attorney's	101:11,	
23:21	13:3	128:5	17,23	Bachelor
24:6 59:5	association	attorneys	102:7	8:18,23
99:5	12:8,13	23:19	104:11	back
167:2	assume	180:2	122:23	31:14
article	7:8	184:5,6,	123:1,3,	43:4 44:2
130:6	84:13,15	24 185:1	6,9,10	45:12
articles	141:18	attorneys's	124:11	48:1
130:4	143:14	86:1	152:2	55:10,20,
artist	190:12	authoritati	172:15	22 56:5
11:23	assumes	ve	Avenue	57:12,15,
arts	131:1	27:24	162:13	22 58:1,
7:20,22	138:23	28:2,12,	average	4,7,12,13
8:1,2,4,	142:24	23 29:10,	46:4	65:4
6,9			131:6,11	66:20
			144:24	72:22
				73:5

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: backed..box

82:9,10,	barracks	152:23	bench	boats
13 89:5	176:16	156:22	191:10	179:14
94:2	base	157:14	bend	body
95:13	57:4	158:13	156:9	51:7
97:2	132:16	160:7		53:11
99:20	144:22	163:18	bending	56:11
102:23	161:11	165:10,22	115:23	103:5
103:1,9,	163:12,16	166:7	bent	106:13
10 104:15		178:3	115:22	108:16
110:8	based	187:24	116:8	115:16
112:22	17:18	190:23	119:13	116:7
115:20,21	19:9,15,	bases	bias	119:13
117:21	23 20:22	90:4	69:10	142:17
119:14	35:5	basic	79:17	166:19
142:21	38:16	126:22	big	bono
152:17	42:18	basically	64:7	188:16
154:1	43:15	148:24	69:19	book
161:24	45:20	167:12	bill	28:4,14,
192:8	46:10	178:23	186:1	15,16,17,
backed	48:14	basing	Biodynamics	23 29:10,
150:1	51:15	88:16	168:3	15 31:7
backwards	54:22	141:22	bioengineer	120:4
117:21	60:19	basis	ing	130:5
badge	65:23	38:6 41:9	169:4	books
62:1	86:19	94:20,23		28:19
badger	89:8,20,	143:16	bit	born
86:5	21,22	170:7	20:9,14	176:23,24
badgered	92:16	beat	155:17	bottom
85:20	94:18	51:13	156:8,15	62:18
86:7,12	98:24	beating	black	74:15
badgering	99:1,21	68:7	80:21	156:12
85:14,17	100:4	beginning	81:16,17	bounce
ballistic	101:9	21:2 89:6	85:1	142:2
178:18	103:17	118:23	blends	143:2
ballistics	107:4	120:8	81:15	bounced
11:12,14,	112:13	129:16	blocked	142:1,5
18,20,21	114:5	158:11	75:20,22	154:1
177:4	116:16	begins	blow	bouncing
bank	118:19	76:5	58:10	142:10
53:12	124:23	156:9	blurrier	box
barely	125:2,10	belief	81:13,14	162:13
102:21	127:21,24	156:19	82:10	
	131:12,19			
	138:14			
	140:18			
	145:5			
	146:16			

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: brachium..case

brachium	103:4	call	capabilitie	10,12
50:24	104:16	14:2	s	155:1
72:19	105:6,10,	15:10	140:20	156:11,20
brain	12 106:2,	16:18	capable	157:4
150:22	13 107:2,	19:14	150:24	158:5,7
branch	17 108:3,	44:11	car	172:14
53:1,5	5,15	74:16	74:24	182:15
break	109:2	94:12	cartridges	142:1,10
29:18	111:23	115:7	care	
31:9,10	112:11	122:3	183:24	
37:22	113:19	130:12,20	case	
65:1	118:18	158:10	career	6:24 10:6
96:10,13	146:1,6,	called	176:3,4	18:1,20,
97:1	10,12,16,	5:5 13:2	carried	23 19:1,
145:19	20,24	18:16	133:4,11,	7,11,16,
193:5	147:1	25:9 98:8	17	18,20
bring	bullets	104:22	carrying	20:7,24
30:23	100:22,23	167:7	60:9,18	21:4,8,10
84:15,17	business	173:9	65:16,23	22:4
bringing	7:15 9:6,	187:11	68:14,16	23:2,13
79:12	12,16	Cambridge	69:17	29:21
broke	10:19	8:12	72:10	32:7
31:16	13:17	camera	73:5,15,	53:22
98:13	14:4	52:22	18 164:2,	61:14
broken	33:19	56:6	7	63:14
20:22	179:5,10,	57:11,17,	cartridge	66:16
brought	21 180:1,	21,23	36:18	67:23
19:21	15,19	58:13	53:22	72:1,2
31:18	181:7	camera's	100:15	100:20
191:1	butter	61:8	118:12,24	104:23
brown	105:1	cameras	121:13	118:12,24
76:1	C	53:12	132:4,8,	121:13
brushed	calculation	cams	14 133:24	131:2
70:9	99:6	53:11	135:15	132:4,8,
building	100:4	Candler	137:13	14 133:24
50:16	144:20	190:6,11	139:15	135:16
175:22	calculation	canted	142:19,20	137:5,13
bullet	s	115:10	143:17,22	138:19,21
86:21	99:1	141:7,10	144:2	139:15
100:24	caliber	143:1	149:13,	142:19
101:3,4	174:2	canting	21,24	143:17,22
		125:15	150:10	144:2
			151:6	145:17
			153:14,	149:13,
			18,22,24	21,24
			154:3,7,	150:10
				151:6

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: cases..combination

153:14,	138:13	certificati	children	clearer
18,22,24	146:4,11,	on	10:20,21	118:4
154:3,7,	15,19,22,	25:6 26:3	chose	clock
10,13	23 147:1,	certificati	68:3	91:2,9,11
155:1	2	ons	chosen	106:20
156:11,20	casings	25:11,12	133:10	closely
157:4	35:12	certified	Christopher	154:4
158:3,5,7	36:4 42:3	11:3	10:24	clothing
160:20	43:15	cetera	11:2	184:20
163:10	101:19,22	163:17	chrome	cold
164:19	124:13,17	177:17	59:8	19:20
165:12	125:8	184:6	61:23	Collaborati
181:6,21	126:5	187:2	circumstanc	ve
182:15	130:13,17	190:16	es	25:8
185:24	131:3	challenge	45:14	colleagues
186:6,9,	135:6,22	191:12	139:22	140:11
17 187:24	138:10	challenged	174:1	collection
188:9,11,	139:1	190:22	civil	184:18
14,22,23	142:20,23	challenging	173:14	college
189:2,9,	144:8	191:2,17,	181:21	8:10
13,15	category	18 192:1	civilian	14:18
190:3	15:12	chance	171:1	175:1,2,6
192:10,	114:20	13:23	177:14	177:2
18,19,21	caused	change	178:15	184:4
cases	22:17	136:7	claims	colleges
9:21 10:3	52:22	139:4	162:22	184:23
12:17	115:15	146:20,21	Clancy	color
13:11	cautions	176:3,4	148:14,	60:9 76:3
15:15	125:6	charge	15,16,22	colored
18:13,15,	center	177:13	clarificati	76:2,4
16 19:10	106:20	186:2,3	on	column
20:1,4,10	144:15	188:11	54:21	147:23,24
26:20	153:12,19	charged	clarify	columns
36:18	157:13	87:15	25:1	147:21
100:15	certainty	charging	33:18	combat
172:14	39:2	186:5	40:15,22	173:4,18
177:20	116:12	chase	clear	174:16
180:1	166:15	44:14	81:10,21	combination
181:9,13,	certificate	Chicago	83:13	17:12,16
17 183:3,	25:16	148:17	84:19	18:24
16 186:3	certificate	children	85:15	
188:15	s	clearer		
189:23	176:1	clock		
190:22		clear		
casing		clothing		
126:12		cold		
		Collaborati		
		ve		
		colleagues		
		collection		
		college		
		civil		
		civilian		
		claims		
		Clancy		
		clarificati		
		on		
		clarify		
		charging		
		chase		
		Chicago		
		children		
		clearer		
		clock		
		clear		
		clothing		
		cold		
		Collaborati		
		ve		
		colleagues		
		collection		
		college		
		civil		
		civilian		
		claims		
		Clancy		
		clarificati		
		on		
		clarify		
		charging		
		chase		
		Chicago		
		children		
		clearer		
		clock		
		clear		
		clothing		
		cold		
		Collaborati		
		ve		
		colleagues		
		collection		
		college		
		civil		
		civilian		
		claims		
		Clancy		
		clarificati		
		on		
		clarify		
		charging		
		chase		
		Chicago		
		children		
		clearer		
		clock		
		clear		
		clothing		
		cold		
		Collaborati		
		ve		
		colleagues		
		collection		
		college		
		civil		
		civilian		
		claims		
		Clancy		
		clarificati		
		on		
		clarify		
		charging		
		chase		
		Chicago		
		children		
		clearer		
		clock		
		clear		
		clothing		
		cold		
		Collaborati		
		ve		
		colleagues		
		collection		
		college		
		civil		
		civilian		
		claims		
		Clancy		
		clarificati		
		on		
		clarify		
		charging		
		chase		
		Chicago		
		children		
		clearer		
		clock		
		clear		
		clothing		
		cold		
		Collaborati		
		ve		
		colleagues		
		collection		
		college		
		civil		
		civilian		
		claims		
		Clancy		
		clarificati		
		on		
		clarify		
		charging		
		chase		
		Chicago		
		children		
		clearer		
		clock		
		clear		
		clothing		
		cold		
		Collaborati		
		ve		
		colleagues		
		collection		
		college		
		civil		
		civilian		
		claims		
		Clancy		
		clarificati		
		on		
		clarify		
		charging		
		chase		
		Chicago		
		children		
		clearer		
		clock		
		clear		
		clothing		
		cold		
		Collaborati		
		ve		
		colleagues		
		collection		
		college		
		civil		
		civilian		
		claims		
		Clancy		
		clarificati		
		on		
		clarify		
		charging		
		chase		
		Chicago		
		children		
		clearer		
		clock		
		clear		
		clothing		
		cold		
		Collaborati		
		ve		
		colleagues		
		collection		
		college		
		civil		
		civilian		
		claims		
		Clancy		
		clarificati		
		on		
		clarify		
		charging		
		chase		
		Chicago		
		children		
		clearer		
		clock		
		clear		
		clothing		
		cold		
		Collaborati		
		ve		
		colleagues		
		collection		
		college		
		civil		
		civilian		
		claims		
		Clancy		
		clarificati		
		on		
		clarify		
		charging		
		chase		
		Chicago		
		children		
		clearer		
		clock		
		clear		
		clothing		
		cold		
		Collaborati		
		ve		
		colleagues		
		collection		
		college		
		civil		
		civilian		
		claims		
		Clancy		
		clarificati		
		on		
		clarify		
		charging		
		chase		
		Chicago		
		children		
		clearer		
		clock		
		clear		
		clothing		
		cold		
		Collaborati		
		ve		
		colleagues		
		collection		
		college		
		civil		
		civilian		
		claims		
		Clancy		
		clarificati		
		on		
		clarify		
		charging		
		chase		
		Chicago		
		children		
		clearer		
		clock		
		clear		
		clothing		
		cold		
		Collaborati		
		ve		
		colleagues		
		collection		
		college		
		civil		
		civilian		
		claims		
		Clancy		
		clarificati		
		on		
		clarify		
		charging		
		chase		
		Chicago		
		children		
		clearer		
		clock		
		clear		
		clothing		
		cold		
		Collaborati		
		ve		
		colleagues		
		collection		
		college		
		civil		
		civilian		
		claims		
		Clancy		
		clarificati		
		on		
		clarify		
		charging		
		chase		
		Chicago		
		children		
		clearer		
		clock		

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: combined..construe

83:23	comparison	83:12,20	43:15	123:23
113:16	35:7,22	84:16,17	54:23	conformance
174:22	52:2	122:2	103:13	15:20
combined	55:19	168:9	111:20	conjunction
191:10	113:10,18	conceivably	156:18	102:6
comfortable	compass	99:9	165:9	110:16
86:4	57:24	conclude	170:7	172:15
commander	compensatio	46:11	concrete	connection
177:8	n	47:22	153:13	37:17
178:14	21:3	51:9	157:13,	171:15
commercial	competency	111:6	16,17	183:3,19
11:4	25:14	124:16	concretes	186:9
13:18	competition	concluded	50:15	considerati
commissione	s	103:7,16	conditionin	on
d	133:20	110:1	g	126:4
178:24	complaints	concluding	175:21	135:4,9
committee	178:15	124:24	conduct	considered
185:17	complete	conclusion	182:21,22	23:20
commonly	176:2	17:9,15	conducted	24:6
28:15	completed	25:4	178:14	61:12
communicati	124:22	34:17	182:14,23	165:11
on	129:10	46:15	183:17	167:2
22:16	137:21	47:15	conducting	175:5
24:4,5	completely	49:20	181:18	178:24
communicati	69:20	50:7 54:4	183:16	consistent
ons	74:12	59:1,6,18	conferences	100:14
22:18	79:22	60:17	14:6	106:21,23
23:11	114:19	71:11	conferred	111:10
companies	167:9	94:12	8:22	112:15
12:15,23	complex	99:22	confident	113:23
company	188:23	101:12	144:19,21	114:1
12:20	189:1,4	131:17	confirm	118:24
174:21	complexity	163:10,17	65:15,22	consistently
compare	188:13	conclusions	170:19	16:6
49:2	189:3	15:16	conflict	Consolidate
170:10	compliance	16:24	162:20	d
comparing	16:10	17:3,17	165:2	13:2
21:19	compromised	19:1,23	conflicted	constantly
48:9 50:8	38:23	21:13	87:16	50:22
51:11	computer	23:21	122:23	construe
161:23	81:10,20	24:23,24	conflicts	39:22
		38:15		
		40:10		
		42:16		

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: consult..courthouse

consult 10:4	continue 39:19 137:1	162:11	86:16,17 87:1,7	191:4,13
consultant 6:8 9:4 20:11 27:1,3 191:2	continued 157:15	correct 5:14 7:17 9:13 11:13 13:10 17:6,11 20:24 22:1,8 23:16 24:2,14 25:17 27:11 31:22 32:15,22 33:2,6,7, 14 34:10 35:3,7, 10,13,20, 24 36:5,8 38:2 39:8,23 41:3 42:14 44:14,18, 20 45:23 46:16,19 47:2 48:16,19 49:5 50:4 51:12,20 52:20,23 54:23 56:16,22 59:16 60:20,21 67:12,19, 20 69:22, 23 70:1, 2,3,24 71:1,19 73:23 75:19 77:17 79:21 80:5,8	89:9,10, 24 90:3, 15,17 91:12,18 92:8,21 94:13,22 95:16 98:17,20 99:2 100:1 103:8,10, 11,18 108:5,24 109:11 112:14 113:22 116:24 117:8 119:19,20 121:1,20, 22 122:1 124:20 125:4,5 126:6,9 129:21,22 130:17 131:3,21 137:2,3 143:6,16, 18 148:8 155:3 160:12,16 161:11, 18,21 165:24 166:5,13 170:7 171:15 172:20,21 177:6,9 180:10,20 181:5,8 186:15 187:21,22 189:14,16	correctly 15:24 34:7 50:9 86:18 114:11 Cory 22:11 190:6,11 cost 186:12 counsel 15:22 69:1 73:20 74:1,4 123:24 county 20:2 29:24 93:7 126:21 167:5,7 190:2,17 couple 150:5 court 7:2 17:23 20:2 38:4,8 40:21,23 41:6 42:15 43:14 85:7 128:6 185:3 190:20 court's 41:13 courthouse 84:18
consultants 9:21 13:2	continuing 23:10 177:20			
consultatio n 12:10 15:4,8,11 16:3,5 17:4,21 20:23 22:21 180:4,5, 16 183:19 186:3 189:24 191:24	contractors 9:20 contradicts 161:8 contrary 69:8 contrast 59:7 control 17:23 controlled 139:19 conventiona l 131:9,10 140:16,21 converted 37:13 coordinatio n 161:19 copied 167:16,21 copies 117:16 copy 37:15,16 167:22 corner 77:24			
consultatio ns 181:16 189:11,20				
consulting 183:3				
contacted 12:22 13:5 22:9,10, 12				
contend 160:2				
content 193:1				
context 36:22 184:7				
contiguous 126:23				

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: courtroom..department

courtroom	criminology	data	debates	166:15
84:14	8:21	23:20,23	86:1	175:23
cover	critical	53:13	December	degrees
162:20	39:5	54:20	190:1,15	91:3 94:9
163:23	critiquing	92:17,19	decided	99:24
covered	17:16	95:7 99:9	152:19	110:13
69:20	19:19	101:19,24	193:3	112:24
covering	crucial	107:24	decision	141:14
163:16	124:14	111:16	32:4	demonstrate
crazy	cruiser	158:2	134:23	90:13
13:22	149:19	date	135:1	demonstrate
create	150:1	191:8	150:14,20	d
52:16	cruisers	Daubert	151:9,19	48:20
105:11	143:24	15:8,11	152:12,21	49:9 54:1
created	CTS	17:4,20	159:6	65:18
111:8	25:9	18:2,8	185:21	87:3
credibility	cum	19:9	decisions	88:21
69:5	8:18	20:5,11	178:3	89:12
92:22	current	189:11,	defect	90:1
93:5	9:6 15:20	19,24	105:20	100:8
124:12	16:15,18,	190:3,7,	defective	150:18
credited	22	12,18,19,	127:24	demonstrate
92:14	curvature	21,23	defer	s
crime	156:15	191:6,9,	108:11,21	56:20,24
11:16	cut	12,16,20,	define	59:12
15:16	122:11	23 192:20	24:16	172:11
16:20,21	CV	David	129:20	demonstrati
19:22	24:10	10:23	135:14	on
24:18	172:22	11:4	defined	42:4
28:6	176:13	day	81:22	48:10
30:21	<hr/>	61:6	definition	49:15
126:1	D	days	102:17	87:6,19
155:2	<hr/>	185:13	deflexion	88:12,18
160:5	damage	dead	101:2	172:4
crimes	101:8	51:13	Deforest	demonstrati
29:24	danger	68:8	27:19	ve
167:5	93:2	deal	28:5,6	49:18
criminal	dash	119:2	degree	100:8
8:2,20	53:11	deals	39:1	deny
18:13,14,		28:16	115:22	79:12,15,
15		29:1	116:12	16,18,19
181:17,21		Dean		department
		18:9		133:11

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: depend..disagree

176:18	Dershowitz	64:11	63:11	differ
177:16	185:3	108:17	64:9,16,	136:22
178:22	describes	111:14	22,24	146:16
191:9	53:8 90:5	112:5,8,	65:4,8	difference
depend	172:1	12 113:3	66:13,20	55:14
188:12	describing	130:22	67:3	56:3,4,7
depends	49:8	148:7	68:12	58:6,12,
126:15	102:13	153:16	72:24	15 83:22
depiction	184:19	determined	76:21	differences
109:14	description	30:2	82:15,20	113:13,14
depicts	45:19	101:11	83:1,5	difficult
50:14	50:7	109:14	84:7,11,	39:14
deployment	51:14	determining	12 85:13,	182:2
177:15	92:12	184:15	18 86:2	
	102:8	developed	87:11	Dimaio
DEPONENT	design	187:12,13	88:1,14,	28:17
193:12	126:16	deviate	24 89:4	Dimaio's
deposition	127:5	108:4	93:17,20	28:23
20:17	129:18	deviation	94:5	direction
31:3,13	designed	165:1	96:6,24	48:23
42:4	12:1	diagram	97:6	50:23
48:10,21	101:4	167:9,10	98:2,12	57:24
49:17	126:7,13	168:9	107:15	58:3
78:11	142:20	diameter	108:7	107:1,19
82:17	detail	146:20	114:15	120:24
87:4	52:11	Dicianni	118:6,15	121:16,19
88:21	details	5:8 20:20	124:9	125:16
89:13	45:8	31:5,14,	128:9	135:22
95:17	165:3	15 32:19,	129:3	137:1,2
96:3 98:5	determinati	20 40:11,	136:21	138:24
122:14,16	on	14,18,20	140:12	158:19
123:4,11,	114:5,8	41:16,20	143:12	directly
16 147:9	146:2	43:1,4,7,	145:19,	57:7,19
155:22	153:20	11,20,23	21,24	111:1,2
172:2	154:15	44:2,9	147:6,12	153:14
186:23	157:8	45:4	155:14,18	154:10,12
188:8	159:8	47:16	156:1	156:7
189:10	184:14	48:1,11	159:7	175:14
191:7	determine	49:19	160:15,	disagree
depositions	16:4	51:18,19	23,24	17:10
5:14 6:15	31:20	54:13	164:20	32:24
derive	47:14	55:11,17,	165:8,17	33:4,8
35:19	59:19	21 58:21	168:2,20	34:4
132:20			169:3	39:20
			170:8	
			188:4	
			193:5,8	

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: disagreeing..education

40:3	discovered	89:11,16,	documenting	144:12,
41:9,21,	46:6	18,24	160:5,6	13,15
24 47:9	discrepanci	distance	documents	149:21
56:20,23	es	24:21	155:21	150:13
58:14	78:7	33:20	Dominican	157:16
69:13,14	discrepancy	45:9	173:7,13	158:12,
86:22	164:13	132:15	dot	16,20
125:2	discuss	142:17	74:13	drove
136:14	20:22	153:7	75:8	148:24
140:6	24:9,13	154:5	dots	149:19,20
151:12	29:17	156:2,3	75:9	Duffy
169:24	69:15	158:7	dove	148:20
disagreeing	70:12	162:14,17	76:14	duly
40:6 42:7	161:5	170:16	downstairs	5:2,5
disagreement	164:13	184:13	97:5	98:9
67:18	discussed	distances	downward	duties
71:15	69:1	184:18	51:6	177:10
119:1	133:21	distinguish	115:11	<hr/> E <hr/>
disappear	discussion	136:17	125:15	
161:16	55:8	distorted	dozens	e-mail
disappears	167:24	61:9	160:9	22:15
162:8	disk	distortions	draw	24:5
discharge	31:1	52:19	45:17	earlier
19:5,13	37:15	district	53:13	162:1
discharged	167:17,	184:5,24	85:8	165:22
36:18	18,19	185:1	111:20	168:7,19
118:12	dislocated	DJS	161:19	189:10
149:13	144:3,5	13:3,8,9	171:20	easily
154:24	dislocation	DNA	DRI	145:5
156:19	125:23	66:8	14:17	east
158:5	dispatch	doctor	drive	57:17
172:13	177:14	123:3	13:22	157:9
182:15	dispatchers	document	driver	158:8
disclose	177:14	20:16	11:4,5	Eclipse
127:20	dispute	66:10	driver's	179:6
188:1	151:14	82:16	27:14	Ed
disclosed	152:18,19	96:2 98:3	driveway	28:15
127:13,22	disputes	147:8,14	50:18	education
143:23	50:7 89:7	160:10,11	77:22	8:16
disclosure	disputing	167:6,8,	78:5,13	
188:3	80:8 85:4	16		

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: effect..evidence

effect	elbow	144:9,11	enhances	74:2
65:13	51:1	189:3,5	107:10	92:22
94:14	72:20	ended	enhancing	93:4
121:2	Electric	143:5	85:15	106:8
132:14,18	174:21	endless	entered	162:9
133:22,	175:7,15	71:9	31:3	evaluated
23,24	electrical	ends	entire	100:6,7
135:5	162:12	15:5	21:10	109:20
138:13	eliminate	enforcement	29:23	133:9
141:8	150:11	5:24 8:18	31:7	evaluating
143:2	else's	9:3 11:7	122:11	106:18
146:3,11	192:1	26:8 27:2	entrance	evaluation
149:8	employ	176:7	86:16	38:14
153:21	17:19	engage	entry	71:3,6,
164:11	29:6	10:2	107:3	14,19,23
efficient	44:23	engaged	108:14,20	79:24
43:18	employed	21:4 22:3	113:12,19	88:16
eject	10:14	engagement	erect	94:10
140:4,5	16:19	21:3,8	114:24	124:8
ejected	17:2	engineer	Eric	133:6
132:10	18:21,24	103:1	21:6	160:11
135:16,	19:19	engineering	error	178:17
22,23	24:22	14:13	130:12,15	evaluations
137:13	employee	130:7	erupts	177:19
138:9	175:9	168:3	13:24	evening
139:15	181:1	174:20,23	established	176:18
146:11	employees	175:5,19,	160:3	event
154:13	9:18	23 176:1	establishin	87:15
ejection	180:23	engineers	g	events
125:2	181:4	11:19	95:4	21:16,21,
126:12,19	employment	181:18	estimate	24 66:7
130:12	179:20	engines	5:16 22:7	78:14
131:15	EMT	174:24	60:8 64:3	100:18
134:1	143:20	enhance	110:14,15	Eventually
136:2,4	EMTS	52:15	estimation	80:18
137:4	184:19	80:23	6:6 95:6	evidence
138:13	encompassed	81:3 83:9	111:4	17:14
141:9	165:14	enhanced	evaluate	19:16
142:8,9,	end	80:22	10:3	21:18
17 150:12	21:22	141:2	21:23	24:20
157:7	130:17			38:9 60:4
182:15				66:18
183:12,15				72:3 87:7
184:10				

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: evidentiary..factor

92:24	examiner	99:17	122:3	47:1
93:4	106:6	117:17,18	128:6,18,	extended
100:10	108:12,17	128:14,17	23 180:4	56:10
102:14	115:14	147:7,9,	191:3	72:17
104:13	123:21	13 155:22	expert's	75:13,17
141:7	examiner's	exhibits	19:8	119:9
142:4	102:8	97:2	41:14	142:9,12
159:5	103:6	155:19	expertise	extends
160:7	108:10,21	exist	11:15,17	81:17
162:3	examining	25:18	22:1	extent
163:12	17:14	existence	44:22	38:24
165:10	exceed	68:9	45:15	39:15
167:10	145:8	exited	48:15	101:10
170:3,9,	excess	158:17	59:5	108:19
11 171:6,	5:18	expand	106:9	114:1
21,23	exclude	101:4	experts	135:13
172:20	117:5	expect	10:2	extrapolate
178:17	excluded	88:3,5	15:17	119:14
184:18	6:2 38:17	125:3	23:1	eyeball
188:12	40:7 41:8	144:8	52:10,14	110:13
192:19	42:18	149:21	187:24	
evidentiary	117:20	expecting	explain	F
30:12,15	167:1	187:23	44:10	
160:10,18	192:14,	expense	71:15	
exact	19,23	84:10	154:19	face
22:6	193:2	expenses	explained	91:9
113:24	excluding	186:11,21	35:6	facing
153:17	101:21	187:1	explaining	50:23
154:24	exclusion	experience	53:24	56:6
examination	166:6,10	108:8	explanation	57:17,19
5:7 15:14	exclusionar	132:22	54:3	58:13
24:19	y	140:19	explanation	72:15,17
98:11	19:15	178:16	s	115:4
168:17	exhibit	experienced	73:13	fact
192:12	20:15,17	125:18	explanatory	25:3 69:7
examination	49:18	expert	148:4	128:1
s	82:15,17	6:10,13	exploring	142:14
16:21	85:8 87:4	12:9,16	15:23	159:6
25:10	88:19	18:21	expressed	162:21
examine	95:16,18	20:5	114:14	191:19
21:4	96:1,3	42:22,23	expressing	factor
examined	98:2,5,20			124:15
5:6 98:9				170:16

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: factors..follow

factors	12:18	116:2	89:9,21	42:8,12
52:23	62:11,13	174:15	99:21	43:17
60:23	126:11	fence	101:11,17	67:15,18
61:14	128:20	74:13,15	fine	86:24
69:16	133:19	75:6,7	11:24	121:8,12
70:13,22	135:3	field	30:17	132:24
71:5	163:9	24:22	32:19	133:12
89:10	164:5,12	fight	72:4	142:24
126:3	171:4	173:17	finger	144:9
130:16	families	figure	105:2,4	151:4,24
facts	181:23	76:5	finish	161:9
19:15,17	fast	file	70:7	162:22
159:24	136:16,20	21:10	179:7	172:10
failed	137:6	23:2	finished	firing
126:22	139:10	31:22	51:24	121:15
fair	141:17	46:11	fire	144:20
7:11 9:4	fatal	files	121:13	firm
16:6	21:5	169:10	133:15	148:18
18:22	feel	192:8	145:1	175:19
22:2,13	42:6 99:8	final	174:9	fishing
30:9,10	feeling	125:21	firearm	27:14
32:12	85:20	144:7	19:5	Fit
33:17	86:11	finance	62:13	169:19
46:17	fees	176:3	77:21,24	Fitt's
50:5	187:3,17	find	78:4,19	145:14,16
107:6	feet	20:10	85:1,2	flash
123:7	50:19	43:14	119:9	53:21
124:14	111:3	123:11	133:11	54:1,16
131:16	118:13	129:13	134:22	62:1
fall	136:9	157:22	firearms	Florida
15:13	144:16	172:9	15:5,15	189:1
52:8	149:14,17	finder	16:21	focus
53:21	150:5,11	25:2	25:9	17:10
132:12	151:6	159:6	60:9,10,	21:7
fallen	153:16,23	findings	11 106:10	118:16
115:24	154:3,8	35:9 36:1	fired	152:14
falling	156:10,	42:17	33:4,15	focusing
115:23	13,14	45:12,22	34:1,11,	19:8
116:9	158:8,19	46:22,24	14,15,18,	fold
falls	159:9	47:8	20,21	17:20
15:12	162:17,20	49:22	39:23	follow
108:9	163:24	50:2	40:6	115:1,2
familiar	fell		41:11,22	

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: follow-up..generated

follow-up	162:3	54:8	120:21,22	27:19
46:7	163:12	64:8,14,	148:6	gained
foot	170:3,9	17,18,19	150:9	46:11
139:4,12	171:6,21	72:23	151:2	Galilee
142:16	177:18	87:8,20	161:21,23	170:20
144:4,6	178:17,20	108:6	165:24	gap
154:4	184:3,13	114:12	166:4,8,	56:15
164:7	185:17	140:8	11	frequency
165:1	192:11	164:16	gave	
		165:4	145:7	69:7
force	forget	frame	Frias	88:18
29:24	84:3 91:2	34:1,15,	18:10	92:12
93:7	146:9	23,24	19:1,11	98:15
122:4	form	35:1	189:12	111:19
126:22	25:15	39:23	190:3	gear
167:5,8	37:11	45:20		164:3,7
forces	147:18	49:7	front	general
173:11	formal	50:8,14,	7:13	16:12
forensic	180:15	21 51:4,8	50:16,20	25:23
11:12	182:11	52:2,3	51:2,7	26:3,4
14:11	formed	61:20	61:22	28:8,13
21:18	109:10	76:5	62:19	29:11
26:3,4	forward	77:6,9,	102:24	36:21
27:24	50:23	10,11	103:9,10	104:19
28:9,13	55:24	82:21	112:22	107:13,19
29:6	118:13	83:1	120:4	111:4
38:12	135:12	112:1	153:13	112:18
39:2	137:18,23	114:6,10	157:16,18	136:8
40:24	138:3,24	116:15	158:1,9,	138:1
52:5,7,	139:22	117:1	17	174:21
10,14	140:5	119:21	full	175:7,14
53:1,9,	141:17	120:3,18	79:23	generally
15,23,24	142:3,19	152:23	147:1	17:18
54:4,6,	150:7,12	153:5,6	182:17	24:14,21
17,22	151:7	158:13	full-time	112:20
59:4,17,	187:21	162:23	175:9	113:1,23
18 71:3,	forwarded	frames	fully	115:7,8
6,13,19	128:24	33:16	142:9,12	126:10
79:23	found	34:5,17	function	139:17
87:7	100:15	50:21	62:2	181:9
88:16	128:15	58:5 77:8		182:14
93:2,4	149:24	80:3		184:14
123:15	foundation	116:16	G	186:2
125:7	49:12	117:4,5,	Gaensslen	generated
126:22		9,14,19		
133:14		119:17		

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: gentleman..hand

146:14	glasses	120:1,14	73:21,22	36:2
gentleman	76:18	121:1,10,	74:3,5,6	86:16
130:8	Gold	18	75:3	95:12
GHQ	179:13	125:15,19	77:3,4,	100:10
177:11	good	135:17	11,13	101:1,10,
Gila	31:6	141:5	78:12,22,	22 102:20
190:2	81:11	156:3,23	24 79:8	104:2,10
Gildea	83:7 85:9	157:3	80:13,14,	105:16
35:14	93:9,12	163:5	17,20	106:16
161:15,20	116:21	174:7,8	82:23	115:13,14
162:7,15,	122:11	grounds	84:19,23	117:20
19,24	123:2	51:6	85:3,5,8,	118:10
171:18	155:13	group	16 107:11	119:11
govern		98:15	115:3,9,	152:2
Gildea's	16:2	growing	16,20,21	184:13,20
36:6 62:1	graduation	154:14	118:13	gunshots
161:6,12	9:1	Guardian	119:9,15,	36:7
163:11	graphics	190:16	16 120:23	115:1
170:13,15	83:24	guess	121:5,16,	161:7
give		9:24	20 125:3	162:10,
7:9 13:23	grassy	31:24	127:5,7	14,16
17:5,8	144:4	169:11	130:20	
18:1	gravity	185:6	132:11	H
36:23	132:13	guidelines	137:13,	
39:10,15	greater	16:15,16,	19,21	H-U-E-S-K-E
41:2	82:2	18	138:5	28:16
42:6,24	grip	gun	139:7	Haag
61:2	62:18,19	45:11	140:3	27:21
68:9,13	125:11,17	59:13	141:7	28:4
69:2,9	130:21,	60:5	142:19,24	29:15,16
99:12	22,23	62:7,11,	146:2	
107:17,22	131:1,8,	12 64:2,	150:19	Haag's
111:3	13	5,12	156:23	130:5
182:10	140:21,23	65:16,23	157:1	Haags
183:11	141:3,18	66:7,15,	159:20	28:5
186:1	ground	19 67:2,	166:21	half
givens	51:4	5,9 68:9,	170:20,23	164:1
14:10	72:15,17,	14,16,17,	171:8	190:10
giving	18 115:4,	19,22	174:2	
14:14	17,24	69:17,20	184:16	hand
69:3	116:2,8,	70:1,3,4,	guns	51:5
116:18	9,13	12,14,17,	182:17,18	59:9,13,
glad	119:18,23	24 71:4,	gunshot	20 60:5,6
160:19		5,11 72:7	28:18	62:10
			29:1,2	66:15,19
			35:10	

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: handle..hollow

67:10	185:2	11:21	111:8,10	80:5
68:23	headlights	highly	115:6	84:19
70:12	61:23	87:15	116:1	86:19
72:7,11	hear	131:5	119:8	89:8,20
73:6,15,	7:6	145:3	120:2,7	100:6,18
21,23	162:10	Hill	121:3,8	126:18,20
74:3,7	heard	21:6,16,	124:17,21	131:4,20
75:14,16,	36:7 63:8	21 32:22	136:10	135:5
19,24	161:7,20	33:1,4,15	138:24	146:2
77:5,7,	162:13,16	34:11	140:17	151:8
11,13,15,	hearing	36:20	142:2,3,5	156:24
16 78:19,	18:2	39:7,8	143:3	159:12
23 79:1,9	190:3,8	40:6	144:9,23	161:8
80:8,20	191:10,20	41:10,22	145:3	hired
81:16,17	192:20	42:5,12	148:8	10:3
84:20,24	hearings	43:17	149:15	162:21
85:3,5	18:8	44:17	150:3,13,	hit
155:4	heating	46:9 47:4	17 152:19	62:7
170:20,24	175:21	48:16,20	153:5,6,	135:23
171:8	height	49:3,6	17 154:11	hitting
handle	64:2	50:3,15,	157:11,23	62:3
181:10	74:24	17 51:10	158:9,12	hold
hands	125:14	56:21	159:18	27:13
64:7,11,	142:13	57:8,9	160:2	holding
21 66:9	156:23,24	65:16,18	162:21	45:11
68:20	157:1	66:11	165:21	80:13
69:20	held	67:18	172:1,5,	130:20
91:11	142:24	69:11	10,17	157:3
141:12,13	helicopter	77:20	Hill's	holds
142:16	177:16	78:20	21:23	41:1
hang	helped	79:8,14,	23:4	hole
138:7,9	148:13,22	17 80:7	35:7,23	86:22
happen	helps	86:23,24	39:20,22	107:2,17
7:6	102:24	89:7,12,	42:7	108:3
happened	181:1	13,19,20	44:13	holes
17:24	Henry	90:1,2,5,	45:19	104:16
165:11	27:20	18,21	48:9	184:20
happening	high	91:4,10	49:15	Holiday
118:14	highlight	92:6,12	50:7	174:6
hard		94:7,8,	51:14	hollow
37:15,16		10,21	52:2	146:8
117:15		98:23,24	68:17	
Harvard		99:23	69:4,8	
		102:2	74:7	
		103:20,23	77:13,15	
		106:17,22	78:23	

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: holster..inconsistent

holster	157:17	115:16	166:11	58:16
77:21	162:12	151:24	ii	170:1,2
home	163:2	Hueske	78:22	inches
9:14	Howell	28:15	Illinois	62:16
10:14	21:6	Hueske's	26:13,16	64:4
83:12,16	32:24	130:6	27:5,6,11	142:14
84:9	33:8 39:8	hundred	image	157:2
141:2	42:5,11,	5:19 6:5	82:12	incident
Honda	13 44:13	hundreds	85:16	126:23
169:19	47:23	133:15	imaginary	134:9
hook	48:15,24	hypothetica	103:2	164:9
84:18	50:1,18,	l	115:2	include
hope	22 51:10	58:17	impact	5:23
65:14	57:6,7,	hypothetica	125:20	19:14
hoped	10,18,20	ls	132:6,12	21:11
65:10	65:16,23	40:13	134:1,4	70:5
hoping	68:14,16,		135:10,	117:4
31:18	21 69:19		11,14,15	139:21
horizontal	77:5	I	136:7,8	181:20
76:6,7	78:12,19	idea	139:8,12	184:12
115:7,9	86:21,22	88:10	144:14,18	187:18,
125:12	89:7,11,	ideal	149:5,18	19,20
140:16	17 100:9,	127:2	153:21	included
horizontall	13 102:21	Ideally	154:4	20:7
y	106:19	126:24	impeach	21:20
119:9	111:11	identificat	79:13	190:18
horse	114:23	ion	important	includes
51:13	115:19	20:18	32:3	21:10
68:8	119:7,11	82:18	38:2,9	186:8,21,
hotel	120:1,13	96:4 98:6	67:7 78:2	23 188:24
174:6	121:10,12	147:10	124:15	including
hour	150:18	155:23	128:1	24:20
186:2,13	151:22	192:13	153:10	182:16
188:21	153:8	identified	158:2	183:8
hours	154:5	109:2	imputing	incomplete
93:15	158:15	identify	46:24	143:7
176:19	163:3	16:1	inadmissibl	inconsisten
186:16,19	166:7	30:21	e	t
188:18	171:7	129:19	38:5	79:7,10,
house	172:1,16	147:14	43:16	11 118:14
61:24	Howell's	155:9	inappropria	120:24
	49:1 51:4		te	121:17
	66:15			123:6,8,
	67:9 72:7			
	77:16			
	78:24			

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: incorporated..job

12 159:12	16:17	115:20	investigati	irrelevant
incorporate	146:19	instant	ons	124:4
d	inferior	138:11	177:22	152:11
9:7	104:23	Institute	178:14	issue
incorporate	inform	175:6	investigati	15:23
s	36:12	insufficien	ve	19:7
45:21	41:14	t	148:18	124:12
incorporati	information	111:16	investigato	125:18
ng	19:24	insurrectio	r	128:5
46:5	21:9	n	26:11	143:10
incorporati	23:20	173:15	27:6	162:18
on	35:18	intangible	178:10,11	183:12
175:20	46:10	21:19	investigato	190:18
incorrect	54:12	24:20	rs	191:6,16
33:22	78:10	intended	27:11	issues
168:11	99:10	7:9	178:2	100:23
increased	111:19	interested	invite	item
181:11	124:6	99:10	185:19	38:9 39:5
independent	129:20	internal	invited	86:17
9:20 25:7	initial	177:21	14:22	167:3
27:3	5:12	178:4,11,	involuntary	itemized
67:22	22:16	14	19:4,13	187:15
79:23	injury	interpret	involve	ITLA
80:12	114:9	29:2 53:4	11:18,20	14:17
168:16	Inn	interpretat	15:16	
178:21	174:6	ion	177:18	J
independent	innocence	47:21	181:17	
ly	181:22	interpretat	involved	jacketed
71:23	inquired	ions	6:11 9:23	146:8
Indiana	15:15	45:17	19:19,21,	January
130:7	Insignifica	interpreted	22 22:23	190:10
192:9	nt	72:7	85:24	191:13
indication	132:2	interpretin	132:9	jet
108:13	inspection	g	133:6,19	174:24
indictment	36:10,12	52:8	134:16,21	jewelry
124:3	inspector	investigati	162:19	10:19
indoors	178:12	on	181:21	JHQ
134:7,8	instance	29:24	190:8	177:8
industry	121:17	65:15,22	191:16	job
11:7	163:13	178:1,5	192:12	93:7,9,12
15:21	instances		involves	176:7
			25:9	

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: John..licenses

John	111:9	177:1	14:9	178:6,22
130:8	119:7,11,			180:9
joined	18 121:1,	L.G.	lawyers	
175:11	17 150:18	190:15	14:7,18	left-sided
joint	151:22,24	laboratorie	23:12	119:6
14:12	158:15	s	40:16	165:23
	170:19	15:17	lead	left-to-
Journal	Justus's	laboratory	105:20	right
130:7	64:11	133:14	lead-in	114:18
judge	95:13	labs	104:22	leg
193:3		16:20	105:4,11	75:11
			106:7	legal
judgment	K	lack	leads	6:11
44:24		19:16	46:14	38:10
108:22	Kentucky	65:24		40:9
junior	191:14	Lake	leaf	
175:2	Kimber	29:23	179:13	legs
juris	58:24	93:6	learning	75:10
14:13	59:19,24	126:21	174:23	length
jury	60:5,18	167:5,7	leave	62:15,17
44:24	63:21	lap	162:24	Lesley
45:3,6	kind	175:20	179:4	8:11
55:1	50:1	large	led	letter
193:4	59:24	61:21	109:23	30:16,17
justice	70:1,9	175:19	Lee	175:20
8:2,20	81:15	late	27:20	lettering
	161:24	22:5	left	10:18
Justus	knew	laude	31:13	179:7,10,
21:5	124:3,11	8:18	61:21	11,13
32:24	168:21	launched	102:5,15,	180:1
39:7	180:2	180:18	21 103:7	level
44:13	knowledge	law	104:6	25:14
47:23	46:5	5:24 8:18	107:1	157:3
48:15	47:8,19,	9:2 11:6	111:18	LG
49:24	20 49:21	26:7 27:2	112:7,11,	84:3
50:22	62:22	42:24	18,20,21,	liar
51:4 64:7	80:13	145:14,16	24 113:20	158:24
89:16,17,	131:20	148:18	114:2,9	159:4
18,24	Kueber's	176:7	115:10,21	licensed
91:17	169:13	laws	118:21,22	26:10
92:2		136:23	119:12	27:6,10
94:7,8,21		lawyer	140:5	
98:23	L		141:8,11,	licenses
99:24			15 156:5	
102:2	L-Y-N-N			

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: licensing..management

26:13	191:15,19	151:3	lost	151:9,18
27:13,15	lit	153:17	89:14	163:10
licensing	164:11	154:24	91:8	166:6,19
27:14	Litem	158:11	lot	main
life	190:16	161:7	35:18	28:20
179:9	literally	172:13	68:2 86:3	major
life-	133:15	locations	184:24	29:24
threatening	litigation	143:16	low	167:5
87:16	9:3	lodging	189:3,5	majority
light	181:15,20	187:1	lower	178:16
62:3,7	lived	logical	104:24	182:23
64:12	177:2	163:17	105:3	make
69:21	living	logo	186:10	34:6
79:13	11:1	11:9,22,	Lucien	38:13
171:6	local	24 12:4,5	27:21	42:1
limb	13:4	long	29:15	43:18
154:9	177:16	12:3	lunch	44:24
156:3,5,	located	26:24	97:8	71:7
12,21	9:9 50:15	62:14	Lynn	114:4
157:6	74:12	97:2	176:24	127:9
limitation	149:15,16	128:19		134:23
112:22	157:5	142:15		154:15
Linda	162:15	162:19	M	157:9
18:10	167:10	longer		158:23
189:12	location	26:7	MA	159:3,6
linear	9:16	93:23	7:18,19	160:10
121:6	35:12,15	looked	machine	163:17
158:6	36:4,7,	31:19	174:2	171:19
list	18,19	83:17	182:17	178:3
15:2	42:3	99:7,15	made	185:21
20:7,10,	43:15	100:21	11:24	188:9
13 30:11	61:4	104:12	15:16	makes
71:5	118:24	109:16	45:1 50:1	10:19
176:22	124:13,16	142:13	71:14	53:19
185:24	125:8,21	154:9	83:21	143:19
189:9,18,	131:2	156:24	85:14	179:12
23 192:3	132:21	167:8	99:1	making
listed	135:6	169:4,23	129:11	21:11,13
23:23	139:1	Lopez	135:1	71:23
30:1,8	142:22	190:2	147:18,20	114:8
169:9	143:15,24	Los	148:2	management
190:2	146:3	190:17	150:9,13,	8:3,11
	148:7		20,21	

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: manufacturer..midnight

manufacture	Massachuset	meaningless	measuring	18,19
r	ts	169:18	157:9	189:12,
146:9	8:10,12	means	mechanical	15,18
manufacturi	175:11	69:4	129:18	metallic
ng	176:8,24	meant	132:11	68:20
174:23,24	177:3,5	10:1	138:4	methodologi
March	179:15	168:21	174:20,23	es
191:7	180:12	measure	175:4,19,	38:14
margarine	182:24	110:5,21	22	methodology
105:1,5	Master	111:13	mechanicall	15:13,19
Maria	7:20,22	149:1	y	16:2
8:9	8:1,2,3,	163:6	150:24	17:2,5,
10:13,14	4,6,9,10,	measured	medical	10,13,16,
Maricopa	14	95:2	54:12	18 18:21,
20:2	match	149:14	102:7	24 19:2,
mark	145:5	156:6,10	103:6	19,21
15:13	material	158:1	106:6,9	41:3
20:15	45:23	measurement	108:10,	101:16
25:10	63:15,20	58:11	11,16,21	184:15
82:15	183:24	64:20	115:13	methods
96:1 98:2	materials	104:18	123:20	16:19
147:6	21:20	107:5,18,	125:24	24:22
155:18	23:16,22	22 111:22	medium	99:5
192:13	24:8	147:22,24	189:6	Michael
marked	29:18	149:2	meeting	27:21
20:17	30:3	151:7	84:8	29:16
82:17	35:19,20	159:9	member	148:14,
96:3	38:16	160:20	12:8	15,16,22
98:4,19	41:2,14	measurement	members	microscope
147:9	42:2	s	12:12	11:10,11
155:22	65:12	21:12	memory	Microsoft
market	127:19	36:13,15,	189:19	187:12
14:3	129:13	17,23	mental	mid
marks	167:4	37:18,23	37:19	144:15
184:13	matte	63:10	mention	middle
192:13	70:6	86:22	129:22	5:11
marksman	matter	109:23	159:11	11:10
131:6	61:4,6,10	147:17	mentioned	74:24
married	66:7	148:3,23	13:20	91:10
10:10	132:7	149:3,5,8	27:17	167:11
matters	191:18	167:4,7,	70:23	189:7
42:21	matters	11,15	101:17,	midnight
		169:12,13		

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: military..number

176:19	126:15	move	62:19	nonexistenc
military	127:9	84:7	119:15	e
172:23	momentum	85:22	166:20	68:10
176:10	132:11	118:9,22	184:16	normal
181:19	137:24	119:24		141:9
183:1	138:2	120:5,6,8	N	north
mine	monitor	137:18		9:11
12:12	81:9,22,	179:8	N.G.	158:6
minimal	23,24	moved	190:15	north-south
136:2	82:1,4,6	111:12	names	58:11
minor	83:13,17,	150:5,7	10:22	112:10,14
139:2	18,20,21	177:3	192:7	Northeaster
Minors	84:3,16,	movement	narrow	n
190:15	18 85:9,	52:13	31:18	8:17,23
minute	15 141:2,	113:15,16	narrowed	Nos
91:2	23	135:5,10,	99:11	155:23
167:23	monitors	12,21	narrowing	notes
minutes	84:2	136:5	100:16	37:17,20
92:14	month	137:21,22	necessarily	62:21,23
misconduct	22:6	138:3,24	17:8	63:1,2,5,
178:15	months	149:23	71:20,21	7,14,16,
mislead	127:1	184:16	86:13	17
25:2	160:6	moving	136:12	notice
missed	179:8	48:23	needed	11:9
128:16	moot	50:23	54:20	November
mission	185:3	53:3	111:20	22:7
21:22	MORAN	57:7,9,	160:20	novice
71:21	40:8,12,	11,24	182:22	125:17
misstates	19 76:18	136:16,24	neutral	nub
66:17	97:4,7	137:1,5,6	153:19	106:1
114:13	167:23	139:7,9,	157:12	107:4
misundersta	168:18	10 141:17	Nevermind	number
nding	169:1	142:3,19	55:2	23:1
114:17	motion	157:15	Newton's	28:19
misundersto	24:21	Multi-part	136:23	83:2 89:6
od	45:8	multiple	Nicholas	130:4
151:20	52:12,16	50:21	190:2	152:22
183:14	136:24	Munoz	Nixon	153:15
model	141:17	191:5	130:8	156:7
84:3,5	190:20,21	muzzle		158:7
	motor	53:20		176:21
	61:19	54:1,16		
	157:23			

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: numbers..officer

numbers	88:8,22	133:15	22 93:16,	69:10
35:1	107:7		18 107:7	74:6
96:15,16	108:6	occur	108:6	77:20
137:11	114:12	32:22	114:12	78:20
	124:4	115:1	118:4	79:14,17
numerical	128:4	occurred	124:4	80:4,7
191:8	140:8	17:7	128:4	86:19,23,
numerous	143:7	112:2	129:2	24 94:7,8
184:4	159:1	116:16	136:18	98:23
	160:13,22	117:2	140:8	99:23
	164:16	118:3,11,	143:7	100:6,18
O	165:4,13	19 119:6	159:1	103:20,23
	170:4	152:3	160:13,22	106:17,22
o'clock/two	188:2	166:12,16	164:16	111:10
90:9		192:4	165:4,13	115:6
	objections		170:4	119:8
oath	40:16	October	188:2	120:2,7
88:19		22:7	193:10	121:3,8,
	objective	191:4		11
object	60:4	odd	offense	124:17,21
32:17		162:20	40:18	125:13
40:8	objects		office	126:18,20
41:12	61:15	ODIM	175:22	130:19
51:21	observation	32:17		131:12,20
59:8,22	123:5	40:17	officer	133:5
62:10	observation	41:12	5:24 6:3	134:6,10,
68:7,20	s	42:20	21:6,16,	14,17
81:16,17	114:14	43:18,22	21,23	135:5
105:7,10		44:1 45:2	23:4 26:8	138:14,24
objecting	obstruct	47:11	27:2	140:17
40:16	154:13	49:12	33:1,4	143:24
	obstructed	51:16	34:11	144:23
objection	120:10,	54:8	35:7,14,	145:1,3,4
42:20	11,12,13	55:6,10,	23 36:6,	148:8,17
43:21,22,	163:3	16 58:16	20 41:10,	149:15,22
24 45:2		63:8	22 42:5	150:3,12,
47:11	obstruction	64:8,14,	44:12,17	17 151:8
49:12	157:6	20,23	48:9,20	152:19
51:16,23	obvious	65:2	49:3,6,15	153:5,6,
54:8	22:18	66:2,17,	50:15,17	17 154:5,
55:16		24 68:7	52:2	11 156:24
58:16	occasion	72:23	56:21	157:11,22
63:8	181:1,23	82:24	57:7,8,9,	158:9,12
64:8,14,	occasionall	84:10	18 62:1	159:12,18
17 66:2,	y	85:11,14,	65:18	160:2
17 72:23	180:16	22 87:8,	66:11	161:6,8,
85:11		20 88:8,	68:17	12 162:7,
87:8,20	occasions			

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: officer-involved..part

15,19,21,	22 68:6,	35:5,20	191:8	owns
24 163:3,	9,13,15,	36:11,15	organizatio	10:18
11 164:2,	22 69:2,	38:2,6,17	ns	
6 165:21	3,8 77:12	39:11,15	12:15	P
171:18	78:8	41:2	14:9,10,	
172:5,17	86:15,18	42:1,19	19	p.m.
176:14	89:6	43:12	organize	97:9
178:19	92:15	44:8	97:1	Pack
179:1	94:18,24	66:16	orientation	173:9
180:6	98:22	67:13,22	45:10	pages
officer-	101:24	68:24	57:10	83:2
involved	108:22	78:16	94:21	pants
22:24	111:7	93:9	99:23	75:10,11
officers	118:2	98:17	102:1	paragraph
65:12	122:7,8	99:12	112:9,14	50:14
officers'	123:19	114:13	113:21	129:15
163:15	124:2,10,	116:22	115:15	paragraphs
oldest	21 127:21	123:7,14	125:11,13	129:15
11:3	128:2	124:14	158:11	paralegal
opens	131:1	138:19	166:18	96:17
71:8	132:17,20	142:22	184:16	parallel
operating	136:23	149:4,7	out-of-	116:8
138:6	138:23	159:10,	pocket	141:4
Operation	142:9	17,22	186:11,21	parked
173:9	143:16	165:14,23	187:1	61:19
opinion	145:3,4	167:3	outdoors	157:23
16:3,5	160:1	169:22	132:24	part
17:5,8	161:6	172:19	134:8	20:21
19:6	163:12	opportunity	outline	34:4,5
32:2,21	165:16	14:24	80:21	35:8,11
33:3,10,	167:8	opposed	85:8,16	36:11,14
12 34:10,	171:7,24	71:22	over-the-	44:10
19,21,22	172:3,10	73:4	road	45:19
35:4	183:12	105:7	11:4	46:21,23
40:6,23	187:24	125:17	overhead	47:1 52:7
41:15	opinions	139:2	overseeing	58:23
42:7,23,	6:23 10:7	182:11	177:15	61:24
24 43:17	18:17,19	oral	overstating	62:19
44:11	19:9,15	93:3	25:3	69:10
45:18	24:6	162:2		72:14
55:23	30:12,15	182:10		76:2,10,
66:14	31:20	order		11 102:4
67:10,17,	32:7,10,	31:20		
	15,23	83:2		
	33:24	143:15		
	34:13			

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: partial..pistol

104:24	134:1	permits	Pharo	photos
162:12	182:16	182:2	191:14	30:20,21
166:6	183:16	permitted	phase	31:17,21
175:5,6	Paxton	180:7	179:9	32:1 82:3
177:23	8:10	person	Phoenix	96:8
186:23	PC	45:10	9:9 13:5	100:22
192:22	82:7	46:4	83:17	117:12
partial	PDF	53:21	84:8	physical
39:15	37:14	78:18	photo	21:17
102:4	Peabody	87:14,18	82:23	24:19
partially	177:3	105:6	105:22	92:24
102:3	peer-	125:18	155:2,12,	126:16
partners	reviewed	144:3	16 156:6	159:5
180:21	184:3,7,8	157:1	photograph	163:15
parts	185:7,22	163:23	95:7,14,	physically
101:15	pen	165:2	19 105:16	49:9
past	76:23	person's	110:20,23	physicist
18:4,5,6	Pennsylvani	66:9	113:6,7	136:23
path	a	personal	155:6,8	physics
103:5	13:4	36:10,12	photographi	138:1
108:4	people	personally	c	pick
157:7	39:12	9:23 10:5	102:14	25:21
164:14	47:4,9,14	182:14	photographs	61:8
pathway	53:3 60:8	personnel	31:19	100:21
102:8	67:14	16:20	64:10	picked
108:15	72:21	125:24	66:10	98:16
153:13,20	101:13,15	perspective	80:18	99:13
157:5,13,	109:15	21:13	83:4	picture
16,17	125:24	36:21	95:6,20	185:5
patrol	percent	38:13	98:14	piece
176:14,16	109:24	40:24	99:2,5,7,	87:7
pattern	140:3	45:16	11,14,16	
126:20	perfectly	49:5,11	100:4,5,	pistol
131:14,15	87:17	106:10	17 104:8	59:8
136:3	140:21	123:16	106:16	80:5,7
137:5	perform	124:1	109:1,22	115:6
141:9	186:9	192:24	110:17	125:11,
142:8,9	peril	pertain	111:17,19	14,16
150:12	162:2	6:23	113:4,11,	126:15
184:10	perjury	Peter	18 123:8	127:1
patterns	124:3	27:19	154:23	129:16
125:3			photography	130:2,13
			25:22	133:16
				142:15

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: pistols..precautions

157:4	156:17	169:18	police-	111:24
158:15,18	159:9	172:16	trained	112:13
159:19		188:18	131:7	113:14
	point			
pistols	30:19	pointed	Pomier	positions
129:24	31:24	120:23	192:18	43:9 89:7
132:23,24	35:2	121:16		111:8
133:4,8	44:14	158:19	poor	178:13
182:17	48:9 49:1		83:8	
	53:7,8	pointer	portion	possibiliti
placard	55:24	76:19,22	57:22	es
153:15	76:15	80:17	105:3	70:20
155:17	78:6,12,	pointing	positing	71:9,10
156:7	18,21	74:18	40:12	117:5
place	79:5,8	76:20,24		166:18
83:15	96:8,14	77:14	position	possibility
102:24	103:3	119:16	87:18	70:21
114:7	105:20	159:23	88:7	116:14
142:18	106:12	162:23	89:12,19	125:23
144:7	107:3,16		90:1	153:24
150:3	114:18	points	100:8	
165:23	116:21	100:13,14	101:14	possibly
166:1,5	117:24	police	107:11	87:16
178:17	118:14	6:3	111:11	post
	120:9,10	131:11	114:23	74:15
placing	121:3	133:4,6,	119:11	75:6,7,
21:12	124:17	18 134:6,	141:6	21,23
36:22	125:20	10,14,17	151:21	76:6,7
45:13,16	132:5,12	138:14	153:19	
66:7	134:1	141:5,21	157:11,12	posture
157:10,11	135:11,	144:24	175:18	100:13
	14,15	148:17	178:12	151:24
plaintiff	136:7	163:14		166:7,19
23:12,19	139:8	175:12	positioned	172:16
79:20	144:14,17	176:5,10,	45:11	
	146:8	15,17,18	51:5	postures
plaintiff's	149:18	177:5,16,	105:18	45:9
190:17	150:19	21 178:19		52:12
	151:22	180:5	positioning	posturing
plane	152:1	182:8,24	39:11	40:12
51:4	153:8,21	183:8	42:17	
119:10	154:3	185:8,9,	48:22	Power
140:17	155:5	13 191:9	67:14	173:9
	156:6		86:20	
planes	163:4	police-	94:7	Practical
179:14	166:17	involved	98:22	28:18
	167:9,12	22:23	99:23	precautions
play			101:13,18	66:8
36:16,17			109:15	
125:23				
152:13				

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: preceding..put

preceding 50:21	pressure 146:13	problem 118:11	13:16 14:4	publication s 28:11 182:12
precise 148:7	prevent 142:20	proceeding 6:12	propellant 147:3,4	publish 182:4 183:24
precluded 95:8	prevented 69:16 70:13,23	proceedings 31:4,13	properties 167:21	published 16:23 182:3,5,6 183:22
prefer 182:10 184:1	previous 171:10	process 88:10 115:22,23	proprietor 9:8	pull 31:8 150:23 154:19 167:20 168:7 169:7
preferably 110:22 184:21	previously 98:8	processes 174:24	prosecution s 18:14	pulling 138:6 150:24
prepare 10:7 185:10	primary 11:14,17	produce 119:12 121:11	protect 173:12	pulled 144:1 153:1
prerogative 108:10	primed 158:10	produced 117:6	prototype 183:1	pulling 138:6 150:24
present 16:16 25:1 85:16 159:4 185:12,21	principle 59:17	professiona l 27:15 179:20 186:15	protractor 95:9,10, 11 110:4, 9	pure 11:20
presentatio n 182:1	principles 138:1	Professor 185:3	prove 139:24	purpose 23:7 79:1,5
presentatio ns 14:10,14 182:11 184:1,4 185:7	printed 63:15	professors 184:24 185:2	provide 15:4,21 23:18,19 24:3 38:20 60:4 101:23	purposes 100:24 123:5
presented 17:22 129:5 184:3	prior 34:16 103:5 147:18,20 192:4,5	program 174:22 175:5 187:9,10, 13	provided 21:9 23:16 26:15 30:5 37:1 127:12 130:3,7	pushed 105:2
presenting 19:2	private 26:10 27:3,11 184:6	programs 13:12	prohibiting 12:16	put 14:19 21:22 70:18 73:16 78:23
preservatio n 184:19	probable 154:2	prohibited 182:9	prudence 14:13	
	probative 109:3	promise 84:11	public 11:3	
		promote		

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: putting..recollection

88:9	question	quick	reaction	rebels
103:12	7:5 24:1	55:6	150:22	173:23
107:12	43:8 44:3	quickly	read	rebut
108:3	46:2,7	137:5,7	32:13	23:4
110:4	51:9		43:4,5	
122:3	54:9,16		44:2,4	rebuttal
129:9	55:3,16	R	48:1,2,5	187:23
148:21	63:6 65:5		50:13	recall
155:19	66:21	race	65:4,6,12	20:12
186:16	68:18	158:10	66:20,22	22:22
188:17	69:18	raised	94:2,3	28:19
	79:4	176:23	122:13	37:5
putting	86:11		123:4	103:14
76:18	87:21	range	124:19	122:5
125:7	88:15	116:15	138:16	130:9,15
165:9	89:3	150:15	145:6,22	138:16
	93:17,19	rank	170:18	166:8,22
Q	94:2,12	189:2	reading	173:10
	101:21	rate	49:16	190:18
qualificati	108:19	126:12	50:9	192:20
on	136:18	130:12	103:14	recalled
129:23	145:21	186:10	real	164:14
133:13	151:20	rates	134:18,19	received
192:24	152:17	126:19	reality	12:11
	160:22	130:15	52:20	13:6,7
qualificati	161:24	re-evaluate	rear	30:1
ons	165:15	94:16,17	125:4	186:22
24:10	171:10	reach	126:8,9,	recently
131:20	183:14	47:14	13,14	14:16
140:19	188:5	reached	130:14	19:20
qualified	questionabl	16:24	131:14	recess
131:6	e	17:3,15	139:17	31:11
134:6	87:7	34:16	140:4	65:3 97:8
145:4	questioning	77:22	144:16,17	145:20
quality	43:24	78:4,13	reason	193:7
82:2,4	54:14,15	158:16	42:16	recoil
quantify	122:12	162:11	193:2	121:2,5,
139:6	questions	reaching	reasonable	6,19
quarrel	6:22 7:1	19:23	39:1	138:6
151:8,11	13:20	24:22	47:9,13	recollectio
quarter	17:24	40:9	116:11	n
124:22	86:9	50:19	reasons	22:5
145:2,8,	93:16,18		71:4	123:2
11,12,13	193:9,10			158:14

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: reconcile..report

191:14	28:15	reflection	158:6	138:20
reconcile	63:23	59:22,24	relationshi	146:7
123:22	123:24	60:6,24	P	165:3
reconsider	127:6	61:9,18	48:21	168:12
44:7	169:21	65:24	relevance	192:7,9,
58:20	reference	69:24	68:24	11
reconstruct	18:1 34:4	70:24	remind	6:20
ion	46:21	75:2 77:3	relevant	render
11:16	63:15,20	108:20	32:1	18:17,19
24:14,17	129:11	reflections	78:8,15	40:5
25:6,24	153:9,11	59:21	159:16,21	68:15
27:5,18	167:9	reflective	reliability	101:24
28:3,7,	169:18	62:10	108:12	rendered
17,24	referenced	refresh	reliable	16:4
29:7,14	95:21	189:19	17:6	rendering
45:15	referencing	refute	38:6,15,	19:6
48:14	36:19	65:15,23	18,20	34:21
53:9 59:4	referral	66:5	39:17	42:22
78:18	13:12	71:22,24	41:3 42:7	93:8
record	referrals	refutes	163:11	116:22
5:10	12:9,11,	44:12	reliably	rendition
31:14	20 13:6,7	72:4	21:14	143:8
43:5 44:4	referred	refuting	reliance	rephrase
48:2,5	34:5	51:14	125:7	29:11
55:9,10	168:18	88:20	relied	39:21
65:6	referring	regard	95:13	112:10
66:22	33:18	160:4	96:9	164:11
69:1 94:3	45:12	regulations	104:8	replicate
131:5	65:21	182:9	109:14	87:17
145:6,22	74:22	related	122:14	88:6,7
167:23	76:4,16,	6:23	130:1	report
168:1,18	17 120:3	93:19	167:2	7:14 10:7
recording	155:6	99:12	168:8	11:9 15:2
160:4	reflect	relates	rely	20:8,15,
records	61:16	86:15	42:22	21,22
18:12	64:13	relation	54:11	24:9
167:14	169:2	36:19	95:20	29:17
186:1	reflected	48:22	122:16	32:6,13,
187:7	69:21	57:11	123:16	14,17
redirected	reflecting	111:12	126:4	34:9 35:6
121:19	106:12	151:5	remember	37:4,6
refer		153:17	26:20,23	46:18
9:22			93:24	

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: reported..roughly

50:6	representin	results	29:20	rods
67:5,24	g	152:3	38:16	100:11
68:2,3	23:12	165:2	171:5	102:5,12,
69:16	Republic	Resumed	185:11,18	20 103:17
70:11,19	173:7,13	98:11	reviewing	104:13,17
72:13			15:16	108:19
73:9,16,	request	retain	16:3	113:14
17 79:13	184:23	23:1	21:10	115:13
80:3	185:9	retained	46:11	123:9
93:10,13	require	23:5,7	52:8	151:21
95:21	127:20	122:4	revolvers	152:1
102:7,13,	required	retaining	133:7	166:20
18 103:6,	128:22	9:23	Rhetorical	172:15
15 114:14	requires	retainment	55:3	role
122:23	25:13	164:19	right-side	6:8 72:1,
123:10	researched	retired	109:2	2 152:13
127:16,	27:8	26:9	right-sided	156:17
17,18,23	reserving	148:16	104:10	159:9
128:10,24	193:10	returned	166:11	164:18
129:9,10,	residence	127:2	ring	177:23
12 133:5	50:20	reveal	104:21,23	178:9
137:16	51:2	57:15	rise	179:2
159:11	153:13	revealed	175:20	rolled
161:5	resolution	58:4	robberies	144:18
165:15,19	81:8,19,	revealing	53:12	Ron
169:2	21 82:1	109:4	Robert	118:4
182:13	83:6	reverse	27:19	Ronald
reported	resources	103:1	rod	5:4,11
80:10	177:15	review	95:14	7:16 9:6
reporter	respond	23:2	102:16	11:10
7:2 43:6	6:24	29:23	103:1,2,3	98:7
44:5	responded	30:4	105:14,	room
48:3,6	168:9	41:14	15,18,19	85:15
65:7	rest	45:21	106:7,11,	roots
66:23	105:12	52:1	12,21	144:4
94:4	resting	54:18	107:3,10,	rotating
145:23	125:21	60:19	14,22	72:22
reporting	144:7	126:18	108:2,13	73:5
67:6,23,	result	172:19	109:11,23	Rotert
24	25:16	185:20	115:2	148:21
reports	57:13	reviewed	116:5	roughly
140:15		16:16		113:1
167:4				181:10
169:12				
178:2				

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: rounded..served

187:5	run	21:11	116:12	178:18
188:9,10	72:21,22	24:19	159:24	security
rounded	82:3	28:6	166:15	35:6,22
77:24	running	30:21	170:7,11	38:1,17,
Rubenstein	50:18	36:10,12,	182:10	21 44:11
22:20	55:24	21 63:2,	184:1,3	sees
23:11	57:6,14,	5,9 126:1	scientifically	54:15
30:6	16,20,21	143:20	21:14	segment
129:1	58:3	147:17,	scientist	91:16,17,
Rubinstein	72:9,14	19,21	38:13	19 92:4,7
22:11,12	73:4	148:2	40:24	94:9
37:14	136:10,	153:11	53:23	103:22
127:13	14,15,17	154:19	93:3	segments
Rudd	137:6	155:2	scissors	95:3
122:20,	138:14	160:5,10,	184:21	103:18
21,24	143:3	18	scope	Self-employed
123:17	170:19,23	scenes	184:9	10:16
Rudd's	171:7	11:17	Scott	semiautomatic
95:17	rural	school	5:4,12,13	133:7
122:13,16	176:15	173:13	7:16 9:6	182:16
123:4	s	science	11:10	seminars
rule	S-C-O-T-T	7:21,23	20:15,17	14:7,19
38:4	5:12	8:3,7,11,	31:16	184:5
40:22,23	SAITH	14,18,19,	82:17	sense
41:6	193:12	23 24:13,	96:3	29:1
42:15	Sam	17 29:10,	98:4,7,13	separate
49:24	192:18	13 39:2	147:9	37:7
77:2	Samsung	46:2	155:22	separately
119:17	84:4	52:4,5,7	screen	153:7
127:20	Sauer	53:1,15,	81:8	sequence
128:20	129:24	24 54:4,	118:5	34:17,23
ruler	132:23,24	6,17,22	155:20	53:3
109:10	133:4,8,	59:17,18	SDR	112:6
rules	10,16	sciences	148:19	116:18,23
128:6	134:7	14:12	seconds	series
182:9	scenario	26:3,4	164:1	117:18
ruling	134:17	27:24	section	served
38:10	scene	28:9,13	14:13	176:13,15
41:13	16:21	29:6	27:18	177:7
59:10,11	19:22	185:18	78:22	
rulings		scientific	129:14,23	
193:1		24:23,24	177:5	
		45:17		
		99:10		

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: service..SIG

service	135:2	short	shoulder	74:3
25:8	150:14,20	31:10	50:24	77:23
134:13	151:9,19	33:20	51:5	81:23,24
175:3	152:12,	132:14	72:19	119:7,8
	20,24		115:7	140:22
services	158:10	shot	118:11	155:1,16
176:17	173:19,21	33:5		158:16
		34:1,14,	show	159:18,24
session	shoot-don't	15,18,19,	47:10	171:22
14:12	134:16	20 39:23	50:22	
		40:6 42:8	60:1 74:9	sic
set	shooter	53:17	78:24	57:18
16:17,18	103:4	54:19	80:2,16	121:12
83:11	113:16	55:2	82:4	
146:19	131:7	89:13,20	84:14,19	side
180:14	142:21	90:2,6	99:9	57:19
	184:15	112:1	100:5	61:20
shape		114:7,11	102:5,17	95:13
77:4	shooting	116:1,10,	104:1,8,	104:2,5,6
101:3	11:16	12,16	13 119:21	105:9
	21:5	117:2	128:14	111:18
share	22:23,24	119:6,17,	140:3,10	112:3,4,
140:11	24:14,16	22 121:1,	144:24	7,11,16
	25:6,23	18 124:17	154:16,24	113:20
sharp	27:5,18	139:16	161:14	114:6,9
	28:3,7,	145:9	172:1	115:21
sharper	16,24	151:4		117:2,7,
81:13	29:6,14	152:6,14	showed	8,23
82:10	32:21	160:2	58:12	118:1,2,
shed	39:12	165:21,23	100:22	18,21,22
171:6	45:15	166:4,12,	101:18	119:12
	48:14	16 172:17	showing	156:5
shell	53:9,14	174:2	57:12,23	163:1,2
125:8	54:15		80:19	
shielded	59:4 67:8	shots		sided
64:12	78:17	33:16	shown	111:23
	115:17	34:2,11	33:16	166:4,16
shift	125:16	41:11,22	34:12	
177:8	126:23	43:17	51:2	sidewalk
178:13	134:9	67:15,19	60:24	74:17,19,
	135:13	103:7	71:15	20,21,22,
shiny	136:11	116:18,	152:2,4	23 143:23
70:10	141:6	19,23		144:1
	147:17	124:22	shows	149:14
shoes	164:8	142:24	50:17	158:6
88:9	174:5	145:1,10	53:14	
	177:21	161:9,20	68:16	SIG
shoot		165:24	73:22	129:23
121:5				132:22,24
134:12,				
17,22,24				

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: sign..stands

133:4,8, 10,15,16 134:7 sign 10:18 128:10,13 signature 128:12, 15,17 193:11 signed 25:5 128:23,24 significanc e 66:14 67:21 significant 56:7 68:5 123:13,23 132:10,13 143:4 significant ly 82:2 181:12 signs 179:6,11, 12,13,24 silhouetted 51:1 silver 58:24 59:7,19, 24 60:5, 18 62:10 63:21 68:19 70:6,9 silver- colored 60:10,11	similar 60:12,13 83:18 113:13 172:6 simple 66:7 simplest 188:21 single 109:18 sir 5:9 173:3 sit 96:12 situation 87:16 127:3 134:18, 19,20 165:3 situations 139:20 size 101:3 skin 77:5,7 105:10 106:3 slight 135:10 139:18 slightly 51:7 150:6 slow 52:15,16 136:15 slowly 13:22	small 64:6 70:3,4 105:20 176:17 smaller 129:15 soft 101:5 software 80:22 187:9,10 Sole 9:8 somebody's 71:22 son 10:24 11:2,3 sort 6:12 11:14 28:8 70:6 source 21:20 23:22 24:7 29:13,18 30:3 35:19 41:2 42:2 45:23 53:7 65:12 128:1 143:5,11, 14 167:4 sources 123:12 129:17,20 south 50:19	57:7,10, 16,20 103:23,24 111:12 150:7 157:15 158:6 162:12 163:2 southeast 50:19 57:6,11, 15,21 162:11 southeaster ly 58:3 southerly 158:19 space 157:22 Spaeth's 50:16 61:21 157:15,18 158:1,9, 18 speak 14:6,17 84:21,22 185:19 speaks 32:17 special 141:2 specific 29:13 34:23 50:12 53:5 107:13 157:11	specificall y 6:16 Specifics 16:11 speculating 139:13 speculation 45:2 47:11 88:8 spoke 125:12 spring 138:5 Staff 178:12 stance 141:17 stand 7:19 54:18 87:6,18 114:24 standard 16:1,6 41:1 145:5 146:19,23 165:1 standards 15:20 16:17,22 19:10 163:15 standing 43:20,22, 23 91:17 139:3 stands 165:19
--	---	---	--	---

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: start..surveillance

start	100:6	165:21	133:21	121:7
80:19	162:2	strikes	134:2,3,5	summarize
113:7	170:6,11,	105:8,10	135:3	32:14
175:1	19,21	135:16,	138:12	165:20
179:21	171:4,11,	18,19	139:24	summarized
180:8	13	striking	140:2	35:3
started	static	103:5	144:24	summary
175:2	141:16	105:6	163:9,14,	32:18
181:7	stating	106:3	15,19	34:5
starting	165:16	142:21	164:6,10,	sun
188:18	step	strong	13,22	61:4
starts	149:1	25:1	study	super
15:4	stepped	strongly	29:21	141:23
state	50:17	69:14	37:18	Superior
5:9 133:6	Stetler	79:18	53:6	20:2
175:11	148:21	Stroth	63:13	supervisory
176:15	stop	31:2,12	130:9	177:23
177:5,14	150:2	struck	151:14	supplied
182:8,24	154:17	101:2	152:19	37:14
183:8	stops	106:13	164:24	support
185:8,9,	137:2	119:12	subcategory	78:23
13	story	154:1	28:8	100:17,19
stated	175:21	156:20	submachine	162:21
42:20	straight	157:7	182:18	163:10
78:11	51:6	students	submit	supporting
150:13	57:16	173:12	25:7	19:16
158:14	103:23,24	185:3	185:16	127:19
162:16	114:24	studied	submitted	129:13
172:17	141:14	9:2 62:12	129:12	supports
statement	156:8	studies	140:1	111:7
22:2	street	19:3,13	subset	suppose
30:10	9:11	53:10	28:8	18:18
32:12	170:23	59:23	substance	supposed
33:23	171:8	60:2	18:20	71:18
46:17	strides	126:11,	substantive	surface
50:5	163:6	17,19	19:7	50:18
78:11	strike	127:4,6,	suggest	125:19
131:16	104:14	11	72:10	144:13,14
170:1,3,	105:7	129:10,	73:3,14	surveillanc
14,15	106:3	11,12	96:24	e
171:14,21	130:23	130:1,11	131:13	
182:19		131:12	suggesting	
statements		132:16,19		
93:3				

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: SWAT..testimony

33:19	102:15	93:7	terms	19:14
44:12	104:1	122:4	14:1 16:9	49:3,7
	129:17	126:21	25:2	88:6
SWAT	161:6	167:5,7	35:18	190:19
145:6		186:8	40:8	
177:16	talked	187:14	189:2	testimony
	69:19			19:3 23:4
sworn	98:23	teach	test	26:15
5:3,6	107:4	181:24	21:15	35:7,14,
26:7 98:9	130:16,19		25:15	23 36:6
synchroniza	162:1	team	126:23	38:21
tion	189:10	145:6	172:2,12,	39:20,22,
172:14		teams	18 183:13	24 42:7
synchronize	talking	177:17		44:13
100:11	12:10		tested	49:18
	13:21	technician	129:16	51:17
synchronize	15:6	169:12	172:7	52:3
d	31:17	telephone	testified	65:16
170:17	38:12	22:13,14	5:6,21	66:3,18
system	91:1,5,6		6:2,4,14	69:8
177:13,14	102:14	telling	18:2,3,6	71:22
	114:18	51:21	20:5,10	72:1,4
	117:14,	162:18	71:16	78:3,7
T	22,24	tells	77:20	79:7
	122:9	113:11	86:3 87:3	86:20
	134:14	115:14	98:9,10	88:17,23
takes	136:3,4	131:8	111:11	89:8,20
137:12	147:21	136:24	150:17	90:24
150:24	156:2	141:3	159:19	92:15,16,
162:24	180:3	142:23	165:22	20 93:3
164:6	184:18,19		166:3	94:6,11
taking		ten	190:4,6	98:24
7:2 66:9	talks	133:12	191:10	100:7,11
106:16	29:3,5	153:15,23	192:21	106:17,
142:18	tangible	154:3,8		18,21
153:6	21:18		testifies	107:8
talk	tape	tend	87:15	114:13
7:3 13:22	149:1	13:22		122:19
21:2	target	tender	testify	123:16
24:10	184:17	128:7	18:17,18,	124:23
27:18,21		tension	20 19:12	143:8
33:11	TASA	138:5	39:4	151:5,9,
39:6	12:17		53:16	13 157:14
44:22	13:1,8	term	54:18	158:13
52:19	task	66:5	161:4	159:13
73:20	29:24	71:24	191:5,7	160:3,14
77:12	68:10	terming	testifying	161:13,22
		182:15	17:17	

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: testing..travel

162:2,10	140:15	135:16	Tom	131:11
163:11	160:9	136:10	43:18	141:21
169:24	189:12	137:12	55:6	144:24
170:3	thirds	138:7,9	tool	training
172:11	74:14	140:3	15:13	131:4
183:15		150:22,23	25:9	132:22
186:14	Thomas	151:22	184:13	134:19
187:21	95:17	152:1	192:13	145:6,7
191:12,	122:13	162:18,		
17,18	thought	22,23	top	trajectory
192:1,14,	63:1 79:7	163:3,22	15:2	15:5
23 193:2	88:10,24	164:6	189:3	35:10
testing	thoughts	165:1	Torres	36:2
16:19	70:16	169:1	191:8	45:13,15
25:8		173:11,15		95:14
100:16	three-and-	177:21	torso	100:11
106:18	a-half	179:7,8	51:3	102:5,12,
181:19	64:4	182:2	56:16	16,20
182:16	tightness	186:10	total	103:1,2,
183:18	125:16	187:7	109:20	3,17
184:10,13	tilted	188:20	186:22	104:13,17
189:1	141:7	191:16	totality	105:14,
tests	time	times	45:14	15,18
70:1	5:24	5:20,22,	52:17	106:7,11,
182:14,21	14:8,20	23 6:2,3	109:19	20 107:3,
183:2,16,	16:16	26:18,19		10,14,21
23	17:17	183:11	totally	108:2,13,
Thankfully	24:20	timing	165:4	19
134:11	26:24	53:3	touch	109:11,23
	32:9	136:3	148:21	111:15
theory	39:12	tiny	touches	115:2,13
100:16	42:13	64:5	105:4	116:5
thereabouts	45:8	tissue	tower	123:9
144:10	48:23	101:5	175:22	151:21
thing	52:12	today	town	152:1
44:12	61:6 62:4	6:19 7:3	176:20	166:20
90:10	67:14	133:18		172:15
106:14	74:10	187:18,19	towns	transcript
185:4	86:24		176:17,21	49:16
things	89:19	told	traditional	transfer
6:20	90:6	13:9 23:3	141:5	66:8
13:19	93:22	63:9	trailer	transitioni
52:18	96:22	140:2	179:14	ng
68:2	124:7	149:1	trained	133:7
79:13	128:19	169:1		travel

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: treaties..variations

164:7,14	6:14,16	type	38:11	upper
165:1	trigger	6:8 9:21	43:8	50:24
186:10,23	150:23,24	16:21	45:24	104:15
188:24	153:2	22:17	69:18	106:16
treaties	truck	62:6,12	86:18	113:2
27:20	10:18	88:17	89:2	116:7
treatise	11:4,5	95:8	91:22	upward
27:22	179:6,10,	106:1	108:18	102:15,22
53:6	11 180:1	127:7	109:21,22	103:8
129:17,19	trucks	130:13	152:5	111:15
treatises	179:14	141:17	171:3	112:22
19:3,13	tub	146:1,6,	183:21	114:19
27:23	105:1	10,12,16	184:6	115:4
28:12	turn	173:16	185:6	116:6
127:4,7	42:12	180:5	understandi	119:13
tree	44:16,18	184:22	ng	121:11
50:20	45:1	185:4	15:24	125:15
76:9,10,	46:9,12,	188:21,23	34:7	154:13
11,12,13	15 47:4,	types	101:9	upwards
78:1	10,23	174:16	114:11	106:24
101:2	48:15	typewritten	122:24	115:17
120:2,8,	50:1,3,8	102:18	148:17	156:9,16
16,19,22,	51:10,15	<hr/>	understood	utilized
23 121:9,	56:21,24	U	7:10 10:1	88:19
12,14,22,	57:1,2,13	<hr/>	123:20	131:2
24 143:18	82:21	unable	unintention	utilizing
144:3,5	172:6	112:5,7	al	45:14
150:10	turned	114:4	19:4	<hr/>
153:15,18	32:24	117:1	unique	V
154:1,9,	39:8	153:16	60:14,15	<hr/>
12,14	42:5,11,	166:14	universe	valid
155:1	13 44:13	Uncheck	31:19	39:2
156:3,5,	48:24	82:12	universitie	88:17
20 158:17	67:11	unclear	s	92:15
163:3	86:23	76:20	184:5,23	validity
trial	100:9	undergradua	University	88:16
5:21 6:4,	150:18	te	8:11,17,	variance
8 14:18	160:21	8:16	23	139:14
19:21	turning	underneath	unsigned	variation
38:21	45:19	11:12	129:6	135:12
187:21	172:1	150:1	unusual	139:18,21
190:7,8	turns	understand	149:18	variations
191:10,15	161:1	5:14 7:6		
trials				

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: vehicle..window

139:20	140:17	70:24	virtue	weaver
vehicle	victim	71:12,16	57:23	141:17
61:19	36:20	73:11,22	133:13	website
149:23	45:11	74:3	vision	13:15
157:24	113:16	77:23	96:17	14:1,3
vehicles	163:4	78:13,24	visiting	weeks
61:22	victim's	89:22	21:11	23:6,8
ventilating	59:9	90:2	voluntarily	weight
175:21	video	100:12,14	25:7	146:15,20
verbal	33:11,16,	101:20,22	voluntary	147:1,5
23:23	18,19	112:2	181:22	Wentworth
182:10	34:12	114:6		175:6
verbally	35:6,22	115:5	W	west
7:2 24:4	36:19	117:14,16		157:9
verbatim	38:1,5,	136:15	waist	158:8
22:22	17,22	139:11	116:8	whatsoever
version	39:4,13	140:22,	119:8,14	167:13
21:15,20,	40:7	23,24	walking	white
24 24:4	41:8,19	141:12	136:20	50:20
41:21	42:9	149:16	137:6	51:1
66:6	44:11,12,	153:16	141:16	56:13
78:14	17,23	158:16	walkway	61:24
100:18	45:6,7,8,	159:24	50:16	74:13
129:2,4,5	21 46:4,	161:11,	wanted	75:8,9
versus	8,10,14	162:7,15,	23:3	76:13
18:9,10	47:21,22	24 163:1,	122:18,22	wide
190:1,6,	48:9,12,	7 170:16	153:8	177:14
11,17	13 49:2,	171:15,	154:11	wife
191:8,14	14,17	16,17,18,	158:23	10:12,13
vertex	51:15	20,24	wanting	11:23
90:19,21	52:1,6,8,	172:5	78:6,21	179:5,24
91:4,13	10,11,14,	videos	waste	180:24
92:6 94:8	20 53:2,	52:15	32:9	Wilson
95:4	4,9,11,	60:8,20	watching	191:14
103:20	14,16	130:3	44:23	wind
vertical	54:1,4,7,	view	weapon	131:23,24
74:16	15,19,22	78:24	126:20	132:5,13,
75:6,21,	58:24	84:19	129:18	21 133:1,
23 115:9	59:2,12	162:8	weapons	21,23
119:10	60:1,12,	viewing	183:1	143:2
121:6	19 61:16,	77:23	window	
125:13	24 62:8	Vincent		
	65:24	28:17		
	67:10			
	68:16,23			

RONALD SCOTT
HOWELL vs CITY OF ZION

April 04, 2017
Index: Windows..youngest

61:19,20,	worked	37:12,13
21 81:15	9:2,3	
174:5,9,	16:5	
15 179:13	175:7,19	x
Windows	179:24	
187:13	182:24	x-ray
		96:17
winds	working	
132:17	96:11	
133:24	181:18	y
withdraw	world	
77:21,24	125:7	yard
78:4	wound	50:20
173:14	35:10	167:11
witnesses	36:2	yardstick
12:17	86:16	109:10
164:15	95:12	
170:22	99:8	year
171:1	100:10	8:22
Woodworking	101:10,22	18:4,5,6
61:21	102:9	22:5
158:1	104:10,24	133:13
	105:16	181:9,14
Word	109:2	182:1
187:13	111:18,23	yearly
	112:11	133:13
words	114:6	
106:8	117:2	years
113:13	118:18	19:22
115:8,10		20:8
151:21	wounds	26:24
	28:18	133:12
work	29:2,3	179:7
10:6	104:3	181:12,13
11:19,20	105:13	
16:22	115:14	York
99:13	152:2	175:20
108:1		youngest
133:14	written	10:24
148:18	37:20	11:2
175:22	63:17	
178:21	wrong	
181:19,22	32:16	
184:22	37:3	
186:15	92:13	
187:20		
188:20	wrote	
	34:8	